THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

VOL. XXX, No. 3 JULY, 1923

The Last Judgment, and the Status of the Old Church — S. C. Brönniche — 257

The Place of the Higher Criticism, the Historico-Spiritual and the Spiritual Senses in Our Interpretation of Scripture, Especially of the Book of Revelation — Charles W. Harvey — 271

The Second Coming of the Lord: Scripture and Event. II. — William F. Wunsch — 286

Marriage and Its Ruin,—A Challenge to Us as Churchmen and Citizens — Asa E. Goddard — 298

The Study of the Hebrew Language [a review of Fabre D'Olivet's "Hebraique Tongue Restored"] — Jacob Emanuel Werren — 319

(For Editorial Department, see next page.)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

Editorials :

The Mood of Convention, 1923 Wm. F. Wunsch - - - 333
Religion and Morality Lewis F. Hite - - - - - - 340

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies :

"Forgive Us Our Debts" Lewis F. Hite - - - - - 351
Divine Revelations Louis George Landenberger - - - 357

Current Literature :

B. W. Bacon's "He Opened to Us the Scriptures"
Wm. F. Wunsch - - - - - - - - - - 368
M. De Wolf's "Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages"
E. A. Warren, Jr. - - - - - - - - - 374
Mrs. St. Clair Stobart's "Ancient Lights" John Whitehead - 378
E. H. Sneath's "Religion and the Future Life" Russell Eaton 382

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

The New-Church Review first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The Review aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. Messrs. H. Clinton Hay and Mr. Kenneth P. Kempton in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON

50 Cents a Copy | Albert P. Carter, Treas. | $2.00 a Year

(Postage to Canada 12 Cents, and to Europe 20 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)

THE

NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXX.] JULY, 1923 [No. 3

THE LAST JUDGMENT, AND THE STATUS OF THE OLD CHURCH

By the REV. S. C. BRONNICHE

THE Last Judgment having taken place, from what influences does the now existing Old Church live? It is indeed a very important question, which ought to stand forth in clear light to every one who confesses his belief in the doctrines of the New Church, though to many, I fear, it is more or less obscure. The difficulty, so it seems to me, lies especially in getting at a definite idea of what is meant by the Old Church after the Last Judgment; and next to understand in what relation that Church stands to the New Heaven and the New Church.

All that we have to do is to consider the question in the light that is given in the Writings of the New Church, and in view of what we know about the present situation of the churches outside our own organization, and to draw our conclusion.

In order to get an answer to the question: What is the now existing Old Church? we must first examine the term "the church." As every one who reads the Writings of the New Church knows, this word is used in different senses.

Thus it is spoken of as a body of men confessing a certain doctrine as faith, as when we read:

> The church consists of men. . . . A man is a church in particular, and a congregation of these men is what is called the church. (Coronis, n. 5.)
>
> The communion called the church consists of all those in whom the church is; and the church with man enters him while regenerating. (True Christian Religion, n. 510.)
>
> The rest [that is, those who do not approach the Lord alone, and do not repent of their evil work] are indeed in the church, but have not anything of the church in them. (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 69.)

But here the church is also spoken of as a certain state in the mind and soul of man; for man is called a church, and the church is said to be in or with man, and that it enters him while regenerating.

As to what makes the church, we are taught:

> The church is according to the truths of faith and the goods of charity. . . . These are what essentially make the church. (True Christian Religion, n. 244.)
>
> Doctrine alone does not constitute the church with man, but a life according to that doctrine. (*Ibid.*, n. 243.)
>
> That which constitutes heaven with man, constitutes also the church with him. (*Ibid.*, n. 241.)

Let me also quote the following passage which shows that the church in its widest extension, the so-called "universal church" or "the Lord's church," is "scattered through the whole world," thus that it is also with the Gentiles:

> The Lord's church is with all in the whole world who live in good according to their religion, and acknowledge the Divine. (Heaven and Hell, n. 318.)

The next point to examine is: What is meant by "the Old Church"? Here we have another sense of the word "church"; for as every one of us knows, the word is used in this connection to express a certain dispensation or reception of truth from the Lord. Thus in the Writings of our Church we are told of four distinct churches, which

have passed away; and of these the so-called Christian, or first Christian Church, was the last. After that comes the New Church, or the Church of the New Jerusalem. This so-called Christian Church is what is called "the Old Church"; as when it is said that "the Old Church has arrived at its end" (Last Judgment, Preface). It is also designated as "the church at this day"; for we read:

> That such is the state of the church at this day, may be known from these things only; that in the greatest part of the Christian world there are those who have transferred the Lord's Divine power to themselves, and who wish to be worshipped as Gods; and who invoke dead men, and scarce any one among them the Lord: and the rest in the church make God three, and the Lord two, and place salvation not in amendment of life, but in certain words uttered with a devout tone; thus not in repentance, but in trust that they are justified and sanctified, provided they fold the hands and look upwards, and pray in the established manner. (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 263.)

This Old Church is therefore also mentioned as "the present church." Thus we read:

> The faith of the present church cannot be conjoined with charity and produce any . . . good work. (Brief Exposition, n. 47.)

In many places it is moreover called "the former church," especially when also the New Church is treated of. One of these places is the following:

> It is certain that a New Church, which is the New Jerusalem, will exist, because it is foretold in the Apocalypse, chap. xxi, xxii; but it is also certain that the falsities of the former church much first be removed; for these are treated of in the Apocalypse, as far as to the twentieth chapter. (*Apocalypse Revealed,* n. 547.)

In the Apocalypse the last state of this "former church" is described in full, in connection with the Last Judgment, which, as we know, took place in the spiritual world in the year 1757. It was thus not only the former heaven but also the former earth that passed away, according to the prophecy in the Book of Revelation, xxi, 1, where the "former heaven" signifies "the heavens not made by the Lord, but by those who came from Christendom into the spiritual

world,"—the so-called "imaginary heavens" (*Ibid.*, n. 865), "which were all dissipated at the day of the last judgment" (*Ibid.*, n. 877); while the "former earth" is the Christian Church as to its internal state, or the Old Church, which was consummated. That this is the signification of the expression "former earth" seems clear from what is said of the words of the Book of Revelation, viii, 13:

> Woe to the inhabitants of the earth. . . . By "them that dwell upon the earth" are meant those who are in the church where the Word is, and by it the Lord is known; . . . [and the lamentation applies to] those in the church who have confirmed themselves in faith separate from charity in doctrine and in life. (*Ibid.*, n. 416.)

The language in which Swedenborg treats this whole matter is so definite that it cannot be mistaken; and the statement of the time is exact. In one place he writes:

> Thus perished the Old heaven and the Old earth. . . . These things lasted from 31st of March to the 11th of April, when Easter was held, 1757. (Spiritual Diary, n. 5746.)

Now let us ask: What is the now existing Old Church? If this church is to be regarded as a mere outward organization of men who confess the false faith or doctrines of the Old Church just mentioned, excluding all consideration of the kind of life which these men lead, we cannot but say that it has no influence whatever from heaven, for not heaven but hell influences what is false. But if we also regard the inward state of life, the truths of faith and goods of charity which essentially make the church, as before observed, it may be that the true church is found in some of those who in a now external way are connected with the false doctrines of the Old Church. This, however, is in all cases certain: We are not allowed to judge the internal life of any man; we cannot tell whether the church is with such or such men or not. What we are allowed to say is: If certain men are living their life according to a false faith or according to false doctrines, the Church is not with them yet; but if this is not because of their love of evil, they may become of the Church still. Their confession

is one thing and life another. If this is so, the now existing Old Church is in reality nothing but the state of mind in which men have confirmed the doctrines of the false faith of the Old Church that passed away one hundred and sixty-six years ago, thus ceasing to serve as a link of communication between heaven and the world; that is to say, the confirmation does not rest on any external influence like veneration of tradition or of education, but on a love of the evil life which such doctrines may support. From this it also follows that the now existing Old Church is nowhere else than where that kind of people live, and this no one knows. But if we knew, would we really say that they constituted a church? I do not think so.

Now, in case I am right in defining the now existing Old Church in this way,—and according to the Writings of the New Church, I am,—this Old Church does not live from any other influence than that of hell; in fact, it is hell itself.

But this is not where I want to leave the subject; for as you may have already perceived, I believe that, the Last Judgment having taken place, there no longer exists any Old Church; and that, when we are nevertheless speaking of the Old Church of to-day, we are using a wrong designation, for what we really mean is, the present state of the so-called Christian world, or the religious thoughts and life outside the organizations of the New Church,—for I suppose no one of us would say that there is no Christianity except within our own organization. True enough "the Church is a Church from doctrine and according to it" (Coronis, n. 18); but as already stated "doctrine alone does not make the church, but a life according to that doctrine"; and after all who can prove that there is no true Christian doctrine in the world this day except with such as have a knowledge of the Writings of the New Church? It is also true that "there is no church except where the Word is rightly understood" (Doctrine of Sacred Scripture, n. 79); but are we justified in concluding that there can be no right understanding of the Word anywhere in the so-called Christian world, except

with the *visible* New Church? I think we are not; for the Lord's Church, which is universal and essentially invisible, is, as before mentioned, "with all in the whole world who live in good according to their religion, and acknowledge the Divine." To what extent this universal church of the Lord, which must be essentially New, is found inside the so-called Christian world of to-day is of course a question that we cannot decide; though from all that we are able to gather, or according to the observations we have already made, we have reason to believe that it is still small. Moreover, the fact is, that many in the so-called Christian world have in several respects left the dogmas that survive from the Old Church, substituting doctrines which in many cases are derived from mere human philosophy or heathen theology; while others are without any religious confession at all. Still, who can say that with such people there is no real church at all? We know that, in spite of all appearances, the Lord's Church, or the kingdom of heaven in more or less primitive form, is perhaps with them. And it *is* with them, as with the Gentiles, in case their inner life or hearts are turned towards what they know and acknowledge to be true and good, and their love is of a really unselfish kind.

The so-called Christian world of this day is quite different from the Christian Church at the time of the Last Judgment. The situation may, indeed, if we look upon it from without, seem to be worse; but internally viewed, or according to the new light of Revelation, it is in reality far better than many of us seem to suppose. But let me again quote from the blessed Writings which have been given from the Lord out of heaven, that we may recall what is taught there about the effects of the Last Judgment on the world, and also about the New Heaven then formed. The Last Judgment was expressive of a redemption; for we read:

> The acts of redemption by which the Lord made himself justice, were those by which he accomplished the Last Judgment, which

was effected in the Spiritual World. (True Christian Religion, n. 95.)

The Lord is also at this day [that is, about 1770] effecting a redemption, which He commenced in the year 1757, together with the Last Judgment. (*Ibid.*, n. 115.)

The ordering of the Heavens and of the Hells has continued from the day of the Last Judgment [1757] until the present time [that is, about 1770] and still continues. (*Ibid.*, n. 123.)

Now, this new redemption of the Lord which He commenced in 1757, and this ordering of the Heavens and Hells which still continued in the latest years of Swedenborg's life, certainly goes on today in the Christian world and among Christians in the life after death.

Before the Last Judgment was effected . . . much of the communication between Heaven and the world, thus between the Lord and the church, was intercepted. (Continuation of the Last Judgment, n. 11.)

This was even the case with "the light from which the Angels derive their wisdom and intelligence" (Apocalypse Explained, n. 1179).

We are also told:

By the Last Judgment the Babylonians [the Catholics] have been removed, likewise the Reformed who had confessed faith alone, the falsities of whom had been like dusky clouds interposed between the Lord and men upon earth, and had also been like colds, which took away spiritual heat, which is the love of good and truth. (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 804.)

From these and many other like things regarding the condition of the Old Church and corresponding states in the spiritual world, we may understand that finally "in that church there did not remain a grain of truth" (Abomination of Desolation, n. 26); and that the whole church "became so perverted that not anything spiritual was left in it" (True Christian Religion, n. 132). We understand that Swedenborg, in the work "The Apocalypse Revealed" (n. 675), could write with regard to this condition: "At this day there is no longer any church in the Christian world,

nor any religion." But, as before observed, this does not apply to the state of the Christian world of today, as is still more evident from what is said in the work about the Last Judgment under the heading, "The state of the world and of the Church hereafter." Here we read:

> As for the state of the church, it will be dissimilar hereafter; it will be similar indeed in the outward form, but dissimilar in the inward. To outward appearance divided churches will exist as heretofore, their doctrines and the same religions as now will exist among the Gentiles. But henceforth the man of the church will be in a freer state of thinking in matters of faith, that is, in spiritual things which relate to heaven, because spiritual liberty has been restored to him. For all things in the heavens and in the hells are now reduced into order, and all thinking which entertains or opposes Divine things inflows from thence. . . . But man does not observe this change of state in himself, because he does not reflect upon it, and because he knows nothing of spiritual liberty or of influx; nevertheless it is perceived in heaven, and also by man himself when he dies. Since spiritual liberty has been restored to man, the spiritual sense of the Word is now unveiled, and interior Divine Truths are revealed by means of it; for man in his former state would not have understood them, and he who would have understood them, would have profaned them. (Last Judgment, n. 73.)

Now, is not this a wonderful prophecy in all its simplicity—a prophecy not of the renewal of the Old Church that passed away, or of the kind of Christianity which was taught and lived by many in the world a few centuries after the first Christian Church was established and up to the time of the Last Judgment, but of the "Christian church such as it is in itself," "the church that is now first commencing," for "the former church was Christian in name only" (True Christian Religion, n. 668)? Evidently it is the New Church instituted in the days of the Last Judgment that is treated of, when it is said that the state of the Church will be dissimilar hereafter,—not indeed, in its specific form, as it is in the now-existing organizations the world over (for it is said that it will be similar in outward form), but in its most general and primitive condition. In

other words, it is the state of the church in man, when in spite of all outward appearance, in spite of all divisions of churches, in spite of all teachings of the remaining false doctrines of the Old Church, men in the so-called Christian world, as well as in heathen lands, may choose to be guided either by genuine and new spiritual principles of religion, or by false and old traditions. The very first conditions for receiving the New Church have been provided. Spiritual liberty has been restored; communication between heaven and the world, or between the Lord and the church, which during the Last Judgment was in danger of being wholly intercepted, has again been opened; the dusky clouds in the world of spirits, and the cold they caused to spread, have been dispelled; and interior Divine truths are revealed by means of the Word. In the words of the heavenly doctrine:

> The slavery and captivity in which the man of the church was formerly, is removed, and now from restored liberty he can better perceive interior truths, if he wills to perceive them, and thus be more internal, if he wills it. (Last Judgment, n. 74.)

As long as "the former church" with its overpowering influence upon the souls of men dominated, not a single truth of the New Church could be received; but after the Last Judgment, all who open their hearts to the light and heat that now flows in from heaven, or from the Lord through heaven, may enter the gates of the Holy City. Generally men in the world are quite ignorant of the wonderful changes that have already taken place in the internal plane of life; in external respects they cannot help seeing it, for most people of this age do not reflect upon anything else than what appeals to the senses; but there are some who perceive the changes, acknowledging them to come from the spiritual world, or rather from heaven.

To determine from what influence the now-existing churches in the Christian world, as well as the religions of the Gentiles of this day, live, we must remember first that although "churches became vastated, . . . remains are al-

ways preserved; that is, some with whom the good and truth of faith remain, though they are few, for otherwise there would be no conjunction of heaven with the human race" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 530); and second, that "from the people of every church, at its end, has been formed a New Heaven and a New Hell" (Coronis, n. 44). The men of the Old Church, or the first Christian Church, who constituted the remains from which the Church of the New Jerusalem was formed and is still forming, are mentioned in the Apocalypse, where they are designated as those who are "called," "elected" and "faithful"; and we read in the explanation of this book given from heaven, that by the Seven Churches "are described all those in the Christian Church [that is, the so-called Christian Church or world] who have religion, and from whom the New Church which is called the New Jerusalem can be formed." It is not said that it is formed from them all, but

> It is formed from those who approach the Lord alone and at the same time repent of their evil works. The rest, who do not approach the Lord alone, from the confirmed denial that His Human is Divine, and who do not repent of their evil works are indeed in the church, but have not anything of the church [that is, of the living church] in them. (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 69.)

The Christian world is said to be "where the Word is, and by it the Lord is known"; but only those who "live according to the Lord's precepts in the Word . . . make the church itself" (*Ibid.*, n. 10); and the church, which they make is the universal New Church, for we read in the explanation before mentioned that "the universal New Church with its varieties is described by the Seven Churches" (*Ibid.*, n. 66).

As to the New Heaven, we are told in the heavenly doctrine:

> After the Last Judgment had been accomplished, a new heaven was created. . . . [It]was formed of all those who after the Lord's Advent, and up to that time, had lived a life of faith and charity, since these alone were forms of heaven; . . . [consequently that

it was made] of both Christians and gentiles, but mainly of the infants throughout the world who have died since the Lord's time, for all these have been received by the Lord, have been educated in heaven, have been instructed by the angels, and have been preserved, so that, together with the rest, they might constitute the New Heaven. (The New Jerusalem and its Heavenly Doctrine, nn. 2, 3.)

"By the angels of the seven churches is meant the universal church in the heavens, and so the New Heaven in its whole aggregate" (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 65). "All those who acknowledge the Lord alone as the God of heaven and earth, and are in truths of doctrine from the good of love from Him through the Word," are signified by the hundred and forty-four thousand of the Apocalypse (chap. vii and xiv), the number of every tribe of Israel who were seated, and who were afterwards seen standing with the Lamb upon Mount Zion (*Ibid.*, n. 348). None besides these hundred and forty-four thousand could learn the new song which was sung by those who were seen standing before the throne; for this signifies that

No others from among Christians could understand, and thus acknowledge from love and faith, that the Lord alone is God of heaven and earth, than those who have been received by the Lord into this new heaven. (*Ibid.*, n. 618.)

They who stood "before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed in white robes, and palms in their hands" (Rev. vii, 9), that great multitude, which no one could number, signifies:

All the rest who are not of those enumerated, and yet are in the Lord's New heaven and New church, and are they who make the ultimate heaven and the external church, whose quality no one knows but the Lord alone.

In the more detailed explanation of all this, the arcanum is revealed, that "the whole heaven together with the church on earth is before the Lord as one Man," and that the hundred and forty-four thousand before mentioned "constitute" the head or "the face with all its organs of sense,"

while the great multitude, which no one can tell, "constitute the body with all its members" (*Ibid.*, n. 363).

Finally let us note, that "from the New Heaven is descending and will descend the New Church on earth which is the New Jerusalem." (*Ibid.*, Pref.)

According to what has been adduced in regard to the remains from which the New Church in heaven has been formed, and in regard to the descending of this new heaven on earth, all are called to the New Church wheresoever they are, in the so-called Christian world or outside it; but only those are designated "called," "elected," and "faithful," who in heart and mind receive the principles of this church, whether unconsciously and in more simple and general forms, or consciously in the perfect and special presentation that is given through the Lord's servant, Emanuel Swedenborg. As the private opinion of this wonderful man cannot but have some might with us, I should like to quote the following words of his letter of April 30, 1771, to Dr. Beyer of Gottenburg, in which he alludes to the work "The Universal Theology of the New Heaven and the New Church" or "The True Christian Religion":

> I am certain of this, that after the appearance of the book referred to, the Lord and Savior will operate both mediately and immediately towards the establishment throughout the whole of Christendom of a New Church based upon this theology.

No doubt "mediately" is especially by means of the Writings he published by command of the Lord; and "immediately" means from the new heaven.

The question in regard to influences from which the churches, or people in the now-existing so-called Christian world outside the organization of the New Church, live, has already been answered essentially in the statement that spiritual liberty has been restored and a new heaven established from which the New Church or the New Jerusalem is descending. According to the "influx" from the spiritual world, they may now choose to be guided either from the influences of the new heaven or from those of the new hell.

The Lord is coming to them all in the clouds of heaven; He is coming to all in the churches who possess the Word and read it, though only those who in heart turn themselves to Him alone will understand it; also to those who live in a state of Christian Gentilism, He is coming in the clouds of their inner being, and they will perceive Him there in the same degree as they love to do what is good, not because of selfish gain but for the sake of the good itself. In short, all that is living in these churches and men is from the new heaven, however small it may still be; while that which is dead is influenced from the new hell.

The kind of influences which come by means of "influx" is from within, and it is therefore generally more or less unconscious, according to the words of the Lord: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation." But there are other kinds of living influences coming from without (or, as it is called in our doctrine, by means of "influx"), influences that are in full harmony with the "influx" from the new heaven; and they are those which proceed from the heavenly doctrine of the New Church set forth in the Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, where also the spiritual sense of the Word is revealed. True enough, in spite of all that has been done to spread the knowledge of these precious truths in the world, very few know of their existence; and of these few only the smallest part receive them as revealed from the Lord out of heaven. Nevertheless, the very fact that this doctrine has been revealed on earth, the fact that you may point to it in the fixed and ultimate form of the Writings of Swedenborg, and also to the reception of it by distinct New-Church organizations that are working with and for it, is of far more importance than we may now realize. In this new revelation, a perfect foundation has been laid for the "influx" of the new heaven in the hearts and minds of men; and in it the highest aspirations of those who are left as "remains" from the Old Church may be approximated. Therefore we cannot wonder that after the work of the "True Christian Religion," containing the

universal theology of the new heaven and the new church, was finished, "The Lord called together His twelve disciples who followed Him in this world," sending them all forth into the whole spiritual world to "preach the Gospel that the Lord God Jesus Christ reigns,"—for to Christians as well as to Gentiles this greatest of all truths was and is still a new Gospel (True Christian Religion, n. 791).

In the face of this fact have we not reason to believe that the New-Church organizations which were formed shortly after this memorable event in the spiritual world, organizations which are now working throughout this material world, are functioning as the center from which all spiritual enlightenment goes forth to Christian as well as to heathen nations? If, therefore, the members of the New-Church organizations actually live according to this light, they are the most direct supporters of the new heaven. Without the revelations of the New Church and those who are proclaiming its new Gospel, the so-called Christian world of to-day would have no life whatever; the influx of the new heaven would have no base for its operations, and the church universal would be unable to resist the attacks of the new hell, which doubtless knows how to use the remaining false doctrines of the Old Church. But we are not to lose courage. The Lord has come again to redeem His people; spiritual liberty has been restored; the light and life of the new heaven flows in; the heavenly doctrine of the New Church is taught; and the Word of the Lord is seen in its spiritual application. This is enough, no matter that there are so few that see it.

These then are the influences from which the churches of the so-called Christian World and of the nations outside it now live; and all that is dead in it will disappear by and by, all evil and false inheritance from the Old Church will be expelled by the blessed influences of the new heaven and the New Church. And the time is coming when the words of the Apocalypse, "Behold I make all things new" (xxi, 5) will be verified by many.

S. C. Bronniche.

THE PLACE OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM, THE HISTORICO-SPIRITUAL AND THE SPIRITUAL SENSES IN OUR INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE, ESPECIALLY OF THE BOOK OF REVELATION

By the Rev. Charles W. Harvey

THE subject we are to consider is but a special aspect of the perennial problem of our Scripture exegesis. At ordination our ministers vow to "teach the people and lead them, by truths, from the Word, . . . according to the doctrine of the Church, . . . to the good of life." (Book of Worship, Ordination Service, pp. 637-9; or Heavenly Doctrine, nn. 315-8, and Doctrine of Charity, n. 160.) Teaching from the Word, moreover, is also "from the Lord, for He is the Word." Our inquiry then, centers in this "Word" of Scripture. As interpreted by the doctrines of the Church it contains the spiritual and the historico-spiritual senses. The Higher Criticism is the effort to judge of the nature of the Scripture by what is regarded as scientific evidence.

As to the value of the spiritual meaning which Swedenborg was illumined to draw out of the Scriptures, we are all agreed.

The historico-spiritual sense we are not so sure about. Some seem inclined to think it has already fulfilled itself, so that we need it now no further. Others call attention to the fact that of some parts of Scripture, especially the book of "Revelation," Swedenborg gives little else than this historico-spiritual meaning; so that if we would get at the spiritual meaning proper, we must find it hidden in the terms of the historico-spiritual.

The Higher Critical determinations as to what actual

Scripture foundations we have for our exegesis, many say we need not at all. We have the Lord's own words as to His Old Testament Scriptures, that they are "the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms," practically as we have them. We have besides an illumined guide to the inner structure of these Scriptures, and the Gospels and the book of "Revelation" which fulfils them. Why then be troubled about their external construction, or any implications drawn from it? Others fear the Higher Criticism may undermine our belief in Swedenborg's theory or doctrine of the Scripture. These would have us avoid all such discussions and the writers who champion them. But still others say, we need to know this Higher Criticism, or at least its results, in order to be up to date, to get the good from it and avoid the bad; that we might just as well base our Scripture view of the earth on the idea that it is flat and not round as to decline to listen at all to anything the Higher Critics tell us about the Scripture basis for our preaching, that is, for our whole Christian life. This is the position taken in this paper. We would give these results a proper place in the problems our ministers try to solve each week,—how best to lead, by the truth of what is the real Word of God, to the good of life.

Take a significant example. They are sermonizing on the very familiar and popular story of David. They take as a truth the general teaching of our doctrines, that the change from Saul to David marks the change in our experience from the futile attempt to rule our life by self-willed natural reason, to the more inspired idea of ruling it by the spiritual reason; and this means that we must recognize life as given by the Lord for His beneficent purposes, the chief of which is the discovery, use and development of our talents for the best service of our "neighbors" —all the good efforts the Lord puts into the souls of all with whom Providence throws us in contact. Our ministers are trying, then, to lead by this truth to the great good of earthly living, which is "ministry" to the best in others

from the best in ourselves; technically, "the good of charity."

For this teaching, of spiritual, neighborly service, the Goliath incident is especially apt. David is a shepherd youth. He comes right from the sheep to the army drawn up against Goliath. The giant is the embodiment of the bloated pride of natural self-intelligence, to which the stupid, natural-minded Saul, determined on selfish rule, disobedient to God, has given power, and now becomes afraid of. Other men's natural-rational idea of life, that it is given them for their self exploitation, will be master of us and interfere with our own selfish will. The better average of our life-interests, well disposed to the Lord and generally willing to obey Him, pictured by the body of the Israelitish people—see the shepherd lad, with his shepherd's weapons, slay the giant. Thus they were led to swing over their allegiance from Saul to David. Moral,—do the same! Let God-directed, and acknowledged, neighborly service—our best service of the most truly useful efforts of others in life as a Kingdom of the Lord, pictured by a shepherd rule of sheep—become a new, fresh, "young" ideal for our life, and so save us from self-and-world opinioned notions of what life is for. All this is, of course, not suggested as the content of a sermon, but rather as the background for any particular aspect of the story our ministers might feel to be of special worth and timeliness to present. Note that in the whole exegesis the youthful, shepherd David is basic.

Turn now to the Higher Critical discussion of the same story. And in all such references in this paper we shall depend only upon one compendium of such critical study of the Scriptures, which gathers together only the more conservative results out of the long developing, voluminous mass of such work, of innumerable different and often contradictory schools. Our text-book is "The Historical Bible," in six volumes, by Dr. Charles Foster Kent, Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University,

published by Scribners. In this, the whole incident of the youthful David being sent from the sheep to his brethren in the army (I Sam. xvii, 12-31) is dropped from the main text. That incident is declared (vol. II, pp. 89, 90) to be not in "the earliest narrative," but interjected from "later popular stories" or "prophetic traditions." As evidence is cited Saul's final question after the victory: "Whose son art thou, thou young man" (xvii, 58),—this in spite of the fact that David had already been at Saul's court as singer and harpist, and for this and other "valiant" qualities had been made Saul's armor-bearer. These are literal non-sequiturs then. Yet they are essentials in the sequence of the spiritual story.

Now what is the value to our interpretation of such an excision, which is necessary and justified, it may be, from the external, scientific, naturalistic standpoint?

First, if our view of the sequence of the spiritual story is clear, and appreciates its practical spiritual value,—leading directly to this so greatly needed ideal of true "charity,"—the Higher Critical results are a most interesting confirmation of our whole theory or doctrine of the selective inspiration of the Scriptures. This doctrine is that the Holy Spirit of the Lord selected and recombined the merely historical narratives just for the purpose of their "spirit and life." For this purpose, in the case in point, He inspires the scribe to draw as well from the "earlier," more historical traditions, as from the "later, popular ones." Incidentally, by calling attention to the chronological inaccuracies, we are forced to consider more carefully the spiritual reason for them, and so estimate more truly the value of the spiritual lesson which Providence would go to such trouble to include. That which was so important in the inspiring, is surely of equal importance for us to interpret in the experience of life, for the benefit of which, of course, the inspiring was done.

Secondly, as to the difference of interpretation of such incidents between what we may characterize roughly as

the naturalistic versus the spiritual viewpoints. We have noticed how very detailed is the spiritual interpretation, dealing as it does with our real, inner experiences, and relating them at every point to the Divine purpose of life. Contrast with this the comments of Professor Kent:

> That divine Providence which was guiding the fortunes of Israel, was also protecting and preparing the man who was destined to be its future deliverer.
>
> David's experience as a shepherd, following the flocks among the rugged Judean hills, developed a strong, rugged physique. His contests with wild beasts trained him for the later contests with men. At the court of Saul he became acquainted with the forces and leaders who were determining the course of Israel's history. He also gained an insight into the real needs of his nation. His brilliant achievements and fascinating personality won the favor of all ranks. It was also during this period that he attracted to himself certain adventurous souls, who followed him in his fugitive life and remained loyal to him through his many varied fortunes, until he finally became the head of a great and powerful empire. At the military court of Saul in his numerous forays against the Philistines, he became acquainted with the military tactics of his day and learned not only how to lead, but also how to direct effectively large bodies of men. (*Ibid.* pp. 91-92.)

Here we have David's character and reaction to Providence sketched apparently for the purpose of our emulation. As other discussions of Professor Kent also show, he regards the Bible as the Word of God simply to the extent that it records, in some vaguely unique method, the Divine care over this people and their king. The general providence in the case is, however, specifically stated. And, as we shall see further, from his discussions of the book of "Revelation," still more if we had time for the rest of the volumes on the New Testament, this providence he regards as for the end of establishing the world's greatest religious blessing, Christianity, on its necessary foundation, Judaism, with its continually enlarging and more religious view of the nature of God gradually achieved by the Jewish Prophets. This is an idea of Providence, as God's continuous presence and power through the Ages, which we must not depreciate. As taught in this case to large successive classes

of young men, it surely helps in its way towards that which we are taught is one of the first duties of the Church Universal, the "keeping of the Divine among the people" (Doctrine of Charity). To that extent it is anti-materialistic, anti-worldly, and may be a providential foundation for the more directly spiritual teachings of revelation later on.

On the other hand, this Higher Critical study is admittedly naturalistic in approach. It tacitly urges that "by searching we may find out God," of ourselves, without help from revelation; indeed it rules out any such direct, Divine leading. Thus it joins in with all other exclusively scientific inquiry, panders to spiritual philistinism, our human pride, in supposing that we can find out all things for ourselves; with the almost necessary corollary, that we may then use what we find mainly for our own advantage. In this the effort is anti-religious. It is thus also very insidious in its allurement to our own power, and in its implication of lack of need for depending on any specific Divine illumination or other Divine help. Its very language is alluring in this way, and we need caution lest we also adopt it: e.g., "the writer of the Book of Samuel felt the need of" saying this and that; "the prophet here urges his higher point of view." These are implicit denials of our teaching, which would require us to say: "the writer of the Book of Samuel *was inspired* to say" this and that; "the fuller *inspiration* of the prophet gives him the higher point of view," etc.

Summarizing thus far then, it would seem of value to us to know all we can of any sure conclusions we can find of the scientific, Higher Critical study of the Bible, just as it behooves us to keep up with any other scientific effort to find from the outside the nature of things about us. But in all these cases we have to recognize the partial, external nature of the view taken. To make the view full, exhaustive, and useful both to mind and soul, we must add the revelation which the Church gives us of the Divine presence and purpose within all outward phenomena. The especial

value of the Critics' results for our exegesis lies in the greater accuracy made possible in all historical and topographical bases for the inspired recomposed letter and the spiritual lessons we are enabled to draw from it.

The warnings against both over-estimating and undervaluing the results of the Higher Criticism apply more obviously to the study of the book of "Revelation," as to both its historico-spiritual and its strictly spiritual lessons of life. Here the exegetical problem is not unlike those in which the Lord's Spirit in the Word deliberately chooses a simile for its mode of expression. For example, compare "As for man, his days are *as* grass and *as* a flower of the field so he flourisheth," with "He made them to sit down in companies upon the green grass." In both we are to see our states of life in the *mirror* of the grass,—its nature, its evanescence, its low grade of life, its service directly to cattle, and thence indirectly to man. But in the simile text, this is but one of a pair of mirrors, the other being that which grass *corresponds* to, viz., the simplest, commonest knowledge of things which feed or inform our everyday usefulness, e.g., in work, play, or general intercourse. In the simile, we are bidden to see our daily earthly existence thus doubly reflected: first, evanescent, of low grade compared with a possible heavenly, more informed state, not of permanent but rather of immediate usefulness; and, secondly, dependent on items of knowledge gained from the providence of our earthly circumstances. In the other case, —of the single mirror, with the divine simile lacking,—we are bidden to see ourselves directly, under the necessity of resting upon these items of outward knowledge, the comparison with our eternal state not being then in point.

Now in the "Apocalypse," the divine view of ourselves is subject to a further reflection still. It is complicated by the fact that the first mirror, the vision of John, deals with images very different from the simple grass that is familiar to us all. The Revelator's symbols are those of the mind only. They have to be viewed in a light "that never was

on sea or land." Take for example that most cryptic chapter, the 13th. It deals with the beast that came up from the sea, directed by the dragon, making war upon the saints, whom all the earth worshipped except those whose names were in the Lamb's Book of Life; all these worshipped the beast whose number was 666. We go to our Teachings to find the spiritual meaning, the practical life-lessons for the soul, which the Lord is here trying to give us. Swedenborg's preface to his explanation states, that "the beast coming up out of the sea," "signifies the laity in the Churches of the reformed who are in the doctrine and faith of the dragon concerning God and salvation." This "faith" we learn, from previous references, is the doctrine that "faith alone without the works of charity, justifies and saves." This faith, moreover, is that which denies the Deity of the Lord, making Him only the sacrifice to the supposed justice of the real God, the Father (cf. Apocalypse Revealed, nn. 566, 500, 421). But this only puts before us an historical situation which Swedenborg was illumined to see on the spiritual side. If this apocalyptic mirror reflects only the state of the laity of the Reformed Churches of Swedenborg's day, how does that help us? Manifestly, if we cannot see any of our own states of life also reflected there, the mirror helps us not at all. But while Swedenborg necessarily emphasized the spiritual condition of his times,—perceiving its errors so keenly, as he must have done, urgent to help the Church out of this, as was his prime mission,—he makes very plain in the details of his exposition, that he still regarded his spiritual picture as a mirror of all similar states of life, whenever and wherever they occur. The robbing of the Lord of His Deity, for example, he shows pictured in "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (xiii, 8); and he says this means from "the first establishment of the Church, *as well the Jewish as the Christian* (*ibid.* n. 586). He interprets the "saints," against whom the beast and the dragon make war, as "those who live according to the truths of the Word"

(*ibid.*); and we know how many good souls today, just as in the remnant of the debased Church of Swedenborg's times, are trying their best to live by the Word, and living so, at least by its bare parts, not only through the help of our Church organization, but among the simple good of all church professions.

Again, Swedenborg characterizes the dragonistic doctrine of God, as that which says "the Lord is not to be approached," that is, as God alone; and that the Commandments are not to be kept as spiritual laws, but "moral only," that is, of course, as mere external precepts of obedience. Now would not both of these seem to be common enough states of mind, spiritual conditions, in the average worldly world about us today? In this kind of life, so far as any faith is thought of, is it not most commonly the relic of the past, still implied if not expressed in much so-called orthodox preaching,—the idea, e.g., summed up in the hymn: "Without one plea, but that Thou hast died for me, O Lamb of God I come?" With others today again, faith takes the form of a blind confidence in God as a sort of Good Fellow, who, as an old popular song puts it, "is not censorious when His children have their fling." How very far is any such state of mind and life from any approach to the Lord, the glorified Christ-God, Divine Humanity, as the model for all human living! And, in consequence, the life without this Divine Ideal becomes of the "earth earthy" indeed; and the Commandments are truly regarded as mere expediencies, just to get by the law, or jail, or anything that might cause loss of worldly esteem. And is not this worldliness at war with those who are trying really to live their lives day by day "according to the truths of the Lord's Word"; is it not a constant menace of subjection to those trying to live true human lives on the Divinely Human Pattern? In short, if we should search the Word through for a Divine warning against our present-day, practical denial of the Lord Jesus Christ as God, and of His Commandments, could we find it better pictured than in this beast of

mere earthly living, variously described as coming out of the abyss, and the sea, and the land, and being worshipped by "all the earth," except those whose names are written in "the Lamb's Book of life," i.e., His way of actual, daily living?

That, then, would seem to be the most direct mirror of the spiritual, as against the material-minded manhood of all ages, that the Lord holds before us in this vision granted to the Revelator. And is the view at all hurt by being further reflected, at a little different angle, in the spiritual state of "the laity of the Reformed Churches" of Swedenborg's time? Is it not a fact that those Churches, by their insistence on the "faith alone" depicted by the visionary beasts and dragon, produced, or at least allowed, the state of life which characterized that most debased condition of religion and even morality, the degenerate civilization of 18th century Europe? Surely it is a stirring reminder to the Church of today that she must get hold of this Age and prevent a return to any such materialistic degeneracy.

If this discussion suggests the relation of the spiritual to the historico-spiritual interpretation of this part of the "Apocalypse,"—and it can all be followed into its details and throughout the rest of that book by careful study of our interpreter,—what is the relation to it all of the Higher Criticism of the book and the interpretation thence?

Let us note a few of the things that Professor Kent cites as the conclusions of the conservative line of criticism he endeavors to sum up for us. He describes the book of "Revelation" as "The vision of the ultimate victory of Christianity"; and concludes his discussion of it as follows:—

> The culminating scene of this tremendous drama (xxi, 1-xxii, 17) is one of the most poetic and powerful passages in literature. Here all the noblest promises found in the Old Testament prophets are presented in one stupendous, concrete picture. The underlying thought is, that after all the evil in the earth has been swept away by the purifying fires of judgment, God Himself will come to dwell among His faithful people and to satisfy their every

want. Jew and Gentile will share alike in the privileges of this ideal commonwealth (in which "nothing unclean shall enter, nor any one who practises abomination or falsehood"). Like Paul, the author of Revelation is endeavoring to portray objectively the ideal of the Kingdom of God, the community of the morally and socially redeemed, that Jesus held up before His followers. It is this picture of the perfect social state, as the final goal of creation, which gives to the book its perennial value for all generations. (Vol. VI, p. 277.)

In title and conclusion, then, this student of the work from the outside, admitting no help from revelation, comes to very much the same *general* result as does Swedenborg, with his illuminated view of the descending Holy City as the New Church, that is, the New Dispensation of Christianity for this New Age.

But note the striking differences even in this general conclusion. For Professor Kent, the closing chapters form "one of the most poetic and powerful passages of literature"; they portray "the ideal of . . . the community morally and socially redeemed that Jesus held up before His followers"—in short, the millennium. It is too vague and far off for any one to work for. It puts the Lord's own teaching, moreover, into the same category,—a beautiful, poet's dream. In Swedenborg's illumined view of the symbolism, is it not all Dragonistic, a separation of faith from "charity," i.e., from the immediate need for all to work, in their immediate aims and strength and daily doings, for the Kingdom of God which is the New Church which the Lord is now establishing through the Writings of Swedenborg?

Again, Professor Kent says, definitely and apparently with would-be Christian intent:

[The book of "Revelation"] objectifies and dramatizes the great truth that the supreme power at work in the regeneration of human society is the spirit and work of the Christ and the heroic self-sacrifice which He exemplifies and in turn inspires (*ibid.* p. 271).

But this again makes mere sacrifice, the old Christian ascetic spirit of self-denial, the proposed agent of regeneration, rather than work, "ministry," "charity" or neighbor-

liness, which the New Doctrine requires, with, of course, such denial of the lower self as is needful for the expression of the higher.

Again, then, we find in even these conservative results of the Higher Criticism, and even in their own supposed efforts to be helpful to Christian effort, the need for caution; the danger of the naturalistic effort, which, perhaps unconsciously, sets the spiritual and practical far off from one another, and really in antagonism. But we cannot help noting, also, that by all the hard digging into the outward sources of the Scripture, this conservative criticism develops some religious feeling. This we should recognize and try to help to a larger view and deeper effect.

The same mixed feeling of caution and respect grow out of the detailed study of the construction of the book of "Revelation" as given us by Professor Kent:—

> The author's aim was not merely to satisfy the curiosity of his fellow Christians; it was to prevent their accepting the false teachings and teachers to which he refers in his opening exhortations to the seven churches. It was to keep the tempted Christians throughout the world from bowing down to the Beast which represented Rome and the emperor-worship. It was to hold up so vividly before them the rewards of future blessedness awaiting the faithful that they would resist persecution even to death. . . . The beast and his statue, which had many worshippers (cf. xiv, 11), are apparently but veiled allusions to Domitian and to his vigorous campaign against all Christians who refused publicly to acknowledge his divine authority. . . . Chapters xi, 14 to xx, 15, describe in vivid, apocalyptic form the overthrow of Rome and of Satan. The culmination of the book is a description, in xxi, xxii, of the new and heavenly reign which is to be instituted on earth when the preliminary work of destruction has been completed. Into the body of the book have been woven many older apocalypses and apocalyptic themes, but they all lead up to one grand, final crescendo. Thus, for example, the vision in iv, of Jehovah seated high on his throne, guarded by four beasts, each with six wings, who cry, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty," is an expression of Isaiah's magnificent vision (recorded in Isaiah vi). The Old Testament student also recognizes in the succeeding visions the four living beings of Ezekiel ii, the four horns of Zechariah i; in xiv, vivid descriptions of the day of judgment

drawn from Zephaniah and Joel. The glowing picture of the New Jerusalem is suggested by Isaiah xlix-liv. The figures and symbols of Daniel vii-xii, also reappear at many points. . . . The huge red dragon, with its seven heads and seven horns and seven diadems upon its heads, which "with his tail swept away a third of the stars of heaven and flung them to the earth," probably represents the later Jewish version of the old Babylonian story of Timat, personified chaos, that contended against the gods. In Revelation xii, "that old serpent is called the Devil and Satan, the seducer of the whole earth." He is overthrown by the angels of heaven, led by Michael, who in the book of Daniel figures as Israel's patron angel. . . .

The selection of seven churches is probably because seven is a part of the prevailing symbolism of the book. The allusion to Satan's throne is probably due to the fact that Pergamum was the old capital of the Province of Asia and was therefore the traditional centre of the emperor-worship. . . .

In v the figure of the "Lion of the tribe of Judah and the scion of David" looms up impressively. He proves to be none other than "the Lamb that seemed to have been slain." This unique description of the Messiah is evidently taken from Isaiah liii, 7 ("as a lamb that is led to the slaughter"). . . . The people of promise, of whom the Christians are the lineal heirs, is apparently represented by the woman clad in the sun with the moon under her feet. The male child to whom she gives birth, who is to "shepherd all the nations with an iron flail and who was caught up to God and to his throne," is clearly the Messiah or Lamb whose victorious rôle is later described. The first of the two Beasts, which emerge in xiii, represents Rome and the emperor-worship; the second Beast, her zealous provincial priesthood that has "every one put to death who would not worship the statue of the Beast, and obliges all men, low and high, rich and poor, freemen and slaves alike, to have a mark put upon their right hand or forehead so that no one can buy or sell unless he bears the mark, that is, the name of the Beast." The cipher 666 is the total of the numerical values represented by the Hebrew letters of the name of Caesar Neron (k, 100; s, 60; r, 200; n, 50; r, 200; w, 6; and n, 50; making 666). This identification is confirmed by the fact that in the old Latin version, where Nero is written without the final n (which equals 50), the number is 616, representing again the exact total of the Hebrew letters. . . . The vivid description of the overthrow of Rome in xviii was largely suggested by the II Isaiah's lament over fallen Babylon (Isaiah xlvii), and that of Ezekiel over Tyre (Ezek. xxvi, xxvii).

Is not this interesting; and may it not all be true? Why

may not the compiler of the Apocalypse have been, as Professor Kent says modern scholarship is inclined to believe, "an otherwise unknown Christian prophet who wrote about 95 A. D., and, like the writers of the Gospel and Epistles of John, belonged to the Johannine school who were strongly influenced by John, the presbyter of Ephesus"? Why may not this writer have been led by the Holy Spirit to see his vision in the light of Old Testament prophecy, shed upon the grievious conditions of his time under Nero or Domitian? It would still be no different from the way in which those earlier prophesies were inspired, through the conditions *their* writers experienced; just as the whole Old Testament Scripture is built, by the same inspiration, upon divinely selected experiences of the Chosen People. We have seen how the same spiritual content underlies the materialism of Rome and that of today, and the similarity of the struggles against it of the saints of the old Apostolic Age and of the would-be "saintly" of the New. In the War time there were foolish efforts to identify literally the Kaiser with the Apocalyptic Beast; they even assured us they had gotten his number clearly as "666"! But in spite of the abuse of the idea, we felt the War time was almost certainly a modern fulfillment of the Apocalyptic Armageddon, for many of the same spiritual conditions could be identified, let the supposed literal ones be as they might. And some fulfillment of the general conclusion of the Apocalyptic vision certainly resulted from the War in the recognition of a possible Christian neighborliness among nations in place of the old international enmities and aggressions. Thus for the War time just passed, as for early Christian times, throughout the Lord's inspired Word, the divinely illumined mirror is held up to all who will try to see themselves and their times in it spiritually.

For all times and ages, then, we believe the Divine lesson is the same. Let us see the Lord and His Church victorious over all opposing conditions in previous times, and be

encouraged to do our part to make Him so in ours. What the Higher Criticism adds is what it believes it finds to be the external construction of the mirror. Thus it adds a new facet to the many-sided, Divine reflection of the human soul in His Book of Life. Surely there is no reason why we should not learn and use its justified conclusions, just as we should all other historical or topographical notes on the letter of Scripture.

Charles W. Harvey.

THE SECOND COMING OF THE LORD: SCRIPTURE AND EVENT

By the Rev. William F. Wunsch

II. An Interpretation of Mark xiii

IN a first paper on the Second Coming of the Lord (see the New-Church Review for April, 1923) we identified the Scriptures which speak of the Second Coming, appraising them to some extent as we went along. We found that the chief Scripture for the subject is the discourse in *Mark* xiii (and in the parallels to that chapter in the other synoptic Gospels). We turn now to an interpretation of this discourse and, incidentally, of a few passages from the Epistles.

Before we take up the Lord's words in *Mark* xiii in any detail, two or three questions which concern the chapter as a whole, call for some consideration. Glancing over the chapter, one would say that the Lord is speaking of two things: the Fall of Jerusalem (as at verse 2); and the Coming of the Son of man (as at verse 26). But are these one or two subjects really? Is the Fall of Jerusalem the Coming of the Son of man? There is a line of interpretation which proceeds upon the understanding that these events are one and the same. Or are there two developments meant here? Another line of interpretation goes forward on this understanding.

The question is created in part by the fact that the Fall of Jerusalem was a Coming of God in judgment on the Jewish nation; there is a measure of actual co-incidence of the two ideas in the discourse. Furthermore, there is no doubt that the disciples who heard the discourse and the evangelists who have reported it, tended in thought to fuse

the two events. They lumped these and other Comings. They made no such clean-cut distinctions as it is open to us in a long perspective to make,* between an historical advent in judgment on a nation, and a second, epochal Coming ranking with the First. But this leaves it legitimate for us to take into account their habit of making different Comings to coincide more or less, and to guide ourselves more by any evidences in the discourse that the Lord Himself did not think of the Fall of Jerusalem and of the Second Coming as identical or practically contemporaneous. There are some such evidences. Strictly, the Lord places the Return not at, but after, the destruction of the city. To that extent He holds them distinct in thought. And in spite of some language looking to the Return immediately after the fall of the capital (*Matthew* xxiv, 29), He seems to see a considerable interval between the two. *Luke* catches the thought of this interval more distinctly than the other evangelists did. He seems to have a long period in mind when he speaks of "the times of the Gentiles" (xxi, 24). In the third place, no such momentous happenings as the latter half of the discourse looks to, accompanied or followed the destruction of Jerusalem. These words were not matched by developments that answered to their portentous language. Instead, the majority of Christians still look for the Return. Finally, as we noted last time, the Return was associated with the end of an age. The First Coming, however, took place in connection with the end of the Jewish age; and the Return must be placed at the end of a further age, or of a first Christian day, if we can admit the thought of it, as it certainly seems the Lord did (*Matthew* xxviii, 20). Of course, any such view holds the Fall of Jerusalem and the Lord's Return far apart. We understand, therefore, that *Mark* xiii speaks of two events or developments: the Fall of Jerusalem, which, to be sure, was

* "The sharp line of distinction which later theology has drawn between the final advent and these preliminary advents is not always observed in the New Testament."—*W. A. Brown.*

an historical advent in judgment on the Jewish age; and yet, distinct from this, a further, epochal Coming of Christ, a Second Coming, deserving to be so called for its criticalness.

A second general question on the discourse ought to be considered before we proceed to a closer study of it. Granted that the chapter refers to two events, just why does the Lord associate them so closely? It seems as though He must have associated them in time; and certainly the disciples understood a time-connection, and reported the Lord as having asserted one, as, markedly, in *Matthew* xxiv, 29. But against this there has to be considered the Lord's declaration that He Himself did not know the day of the Coming of the Son of man. And Christianity, in looking, as the bulk of it has done, for the day in the future, has given up the thought of a time-connection between the two events. How did they come to be associated so intimately then? The Lord and the disciples both started with the thought of the destruction of Jerusalem (cf. *Mark* xiii, 2, 4). His thought ran on to the destruction (*Mark* xiii, 25, 26), on which He would come again. There was some analogy between the two events. In fact it is impossible to say that the second did not suggest speech about the first, as a plainer approach to the subject. The Second Coming was in some ways typified in the Fall of Jerusalem; like that it would be in part a judgment, and come at the conclusion of an era. The analogy brought closely together in thought two occurrences which might still be widely separated in time.

In the thought then that the Lord spoke of two events, which He associated intimately because of the illuminating analogy between them, we become alive to another fact which concerns the interpretation of the chapter as a whole. There results in the discourse a mental association of the Fall of Jerusalem forward with the Coming, and of the Coming backward with the first event, which makes it unnatural to divide rigorously the verses that refer to the one

event from those which refer to the other. It becomes impossible to say that those (5-23) which have to do directly with the Fall of Jerusalem have to do with it solely, or verses 24-36 with the Coming of the Son of man only. Even in their primary reference not all the sayings in either half of the discourse may have to do with the main subject of that half of the discourse. What we want above all is to be true to the Lord's outlook over the future, so far as we can recover it. Some difficulties with what is at best a difficult discourse exist, I think, because the naturalness of a forecast is not imaginatively recovered by the interpreter. We need to reach a life-like outlook on our two events. As the Lord looks into the future the two loom up, the Fall of Jerusalem, and beyond it a more stirring and significant occurrence for Christianity—His Return. He has them both in view. And as He speaks the one pushes up into chief attention, and then the other. This follows all the more surely because the discourse is not a set one, but a running talk. It proceeds easily and flexibly, with a double reference often, and with a play of the thought forward and then a play of the thought backward between the two subjects. Exclusively assign so many verses to the one subject, and so many exclusively to the other, we cannot, with lifelikeness.

This play of thought between the two events named in the discourse sets in at once. While verses 1-23 have to do in the first instance with the Fall of Jerusalem, there is no reading them consistently as though they had only the Fall in mind, with nothing more ahead. Plainly there is something more ahead, something momentous. It disturbs the thought in the earlier verses; it colors the language. The words are too urgent, and the tone is too ominous for the reference to be solely to the destruction of the Jewish capital. The very first words (verse 5) reveal the disturbance of a greater reference. The disturbance increases in verses 19-23. Pointing to a great crisis and sounding urgent warnings, these words find some fulfilment at the Fall of Jerusa-

lem, but not a fulfilment to satisfy all their meaning and to justify entirely their tone. This contagiousness of an event "up forward," giving an earlier happening an ominousness which it does not possess in itself, is not an infrequent feature of apocalyptic discourse. There is a good example of it in *Joel*. The prophet is describing a plague of locusts. He takes it in itself to be a judgment on Israel, but it portends to him a greater judgment. He handles it as a type of the greater judgment. Having the more awful event in mind right along, he is soon letting the thought of it color his description of the locust plague. To say of the locusts that they run like mighty men, that they climb walls like men of war, that they hold their places like soldiers in ranks, that darkness comes with them, so dense are they against the sky, all this has verisimilitude; but then (ii, 10, 11) comes a bit of heightened color thrown forward on this minor judgment by the world-shaking judgment to come:

> The earth shall quake before them; and the heavens shall tremble: the sun and moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining:
>
> And the Lord shall utter His voice before His army, for His camp is very great: for He is strong that executeth His word: for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible; and who abide it?

Similarly, using much the same apocalyptic language, and handling the Fall of Jerusalem as a type of the Return, the Lord in His discourse lets His thought of the latter event already color what He says of the former. It is to be expected.

Yet these verses (1-23) have distinctly to do with the Fall of Jerusalem. However much some of the sayings in them rumble with the sound of a more awesome happening, they referred to and had a substantial realization in the destruction of the Jewish capital. Before the city fell, false Messiahs appeared, against whom the Lord might well have warned (5, 6) His followers,—Simon Magus, a Menander, a Dositheus, a Theudas (cf. *Acts* 5: 36). Other false pretenders appeared after the Fall of Jerusalem, against whom

again Christians had to be cautioned (21-23). Wars were being waged in the interval before 70 A.D., and other wars threatened (7, 8), in which Palestine was or might be harassed. There was scattered persecution of individuals (9, 11-13). It could be said reasonably that, through Paul's missions especially, the Gospel had been preached to the world (10) before Jerusalem fell (note that this preaching is associated with the apostles and the early persecutions). The Temple precincts were defiled (14), it may be by the intrusion there simply of Roman soldiery, or perhaps by a statue of Titus erected within them; the language of strong aversion, of the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not, was measurably satisfied. The Christian community was to take warning and flee,—as it did to Pella (15-18). The very strong words (19, 20) about the distress to follow seem the least likely to hold good of Jerusalem's fall; but, when in a siege of five months, marked by epidemic as well as by the more immediate hardships of war, 1,100,000 lives were lost, even that language loses some, if not all, of its seeming exaggeration. This part of the discourse is glancing all along at a day and event more critical than the fall of the Jewish capital. In the urgent concern that Christians shall not be duped by false Messiahs, in the references to great conflicts and changes, in the world-wide evangelization predicted, in the abhorrent defilement which will have been worked, in these features of the prediction of Jerusalem's fall, we catch a deep undertone of reference to something more ominous. But still, is there any saying in the first half of the discourse which we cannot take of the fall of Jerusalem and the expiration of the Jewish age? Whatever the heightened color the predictions have, due to the fact that indirectly they are predictions of the Return, they have an obvious reference to the fall of the city, and saw a fulfilment in its destruction in 70 A.D. at the hands of the Romans.

What this earlier portion of the discourse tells us of the

Second Coming we shall consider when we sum up what the chapter has to tell us of the Lord's Return.

With verse 24 the Lord's primary reference passes to His second subject. In the vivid language of a world convulsion, He describes the conditions in which He will come (24, 25). As always in Jewish theophany, He will come "with clouds," but with a fresh glory and might (26). Spiritual powers will aid Him in assembling a people who will receive Him (27). Beginning at verse 28 the Lord renews the effort to arouse watchfulness in His followers. They know from the fig-tree when summer is near; let them know from what He has told them when the thing is near which He has predicted (28-31); what He has predicted will come to pass before that generation passes away. They need the more to watch for His Coming, because for that not even He can name the time (32-37). These verses offer the interpreter more difficulty than the earlier half of the discourse, for the event is not so definitely in sight here as that is there, the language is apocalyptic, and the forecast is more sketchy by far than that of the fall of Jerusalem.

The passages in this half of the discourse indicating the *time* of the Lord's Coming have especially made the interpreter trouble. "In those days" (*Mark* xiii, 24) seems to place the Coming on the heels of the destruction of Jerusalem. But we have found reason for not taking the connection between the two events to be a time connection at all. They are related in the Lord's prevision not chronologically but as event that is typical and event that is typified. "In those days" comes then to mean more nearly "in days when the like to the fall of Jerusalem confronts the world." When what that city's ruin was to the Jew befalls Christian civilization, or when a first day in Christianity's life expires as then the Jewish age did, in those days expect the Coming of the Son of man. The "immediately" of *Matthew's* account reflects the impression which the disciples got of the nearness of what the Lord predicted; but this they took to

be all one thing. The time connection, however, seems definitely and incontestably asserted by the Lord when He says, "Verily I say unto you that this generation shall not pass till all these things be done" (30). Of what is this meant? Of the Second Coming, as its position in the second half of the discourse might indicate? Or is it justifiable to think that the Lord's thought has harked back to the Fall of Jerusalem here? With verse 28 He has obviously begun on a separate thought. He has begun sounding the note on which the discourse concludes, and which becomes uppermost in what He has to say, namely, the injunction to watch. It has become His purpose to set His followers in an attitude informable by the event. With this new division in His discourse why should He not urge first watching for the Fall of the Capital (returning to the thought of 14-18), and be speaking of that event in 28-31, declaring that it will occur in the lifetime of at least some of His hearers? Of the day of the Second Coming, to which He would then go next (32), He professes not to know. Would this not be true to a prevision in which the one subject of His discourse is raised into prominence, then the other, in a spontaneous coming and going of thought? At least the uncertainty otherwise in the reference of verse 30 is too great to allow one to rest on that saying alone the case for the time of the Second Advent.*

There have also been conflicting interpretations of the passages which describe the *manner* of the Coming. We refer to the words on the conditions which will prevail when the Lord comes:

* There is the possibility that "generation" means the Jewish race. It is so understood, but in the course of a "spiritual interpretation" of Matthew xxiv, in "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 4231 (2); cf. nn. 3479 (3), 10,497. The word seems not so used in the New Testament (Thayer's "Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament"). Is the passage particularly illuminating if this is what the word means? And did not the early Christians carry away the impression that the Return would be in the first generation's lifetime?

After that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light,

And the stars of heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken (24, 25).

And to the next words, on the manner of the Lord's appearing:

And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory (26).

These words have to be read carefully, with thought for whether they are literally meant or figuratively, and for the history of the language in them. The first passage quoted seems to portend the end of all things. Often the words are so taken. But is it clear from the discourse itself that this is right? If the Lord meant that the physical universe was to come to an end, that was not plain to Luke, for he does not use this language. He only says, "And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars" (xxi, 25). Consider, too, that in the first Christian sermon preserved to us, Peter has used this same catastrophic language (of darkened sun and moon and fallen stars) of the passage of the world out of the Jewish era, as that crumbled, into the Christian, signally at Pentecost. He meant the language figuratively, and he understood that Joel used it so, from whom he quotes it. So other prophets used the same language of the crumbling of empires and the passing of eras (*Isa.* v 30, xiii, 10, xxiv, 4, xxxiv; *Jer.* iv, 28; *Ezek.* xxxii 7, 8; *Amos* viii, 9, 10; *Mic.* iii, 6). Only with the ascendancy of the Western mind in the Church was literal interpretation firmly fastened on such language as this. The Oriental mind was using poetic and imaginative terms to describe vividly and with force what it felt were colossal and crashing changes. Is Peter not, therefore, using figurative language still in these words?

But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. Seeing then that all these

things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? (II Peter iii, 10-13.)

That his words cannot be taken too baldly is plain from what he adds,

Nevertheless, we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.

How would we, in as few words, as powerfully or as vividly, indicate how the old order would go out as the Lord came in? It is not the superficial manner of the Coming that is defined here, so much as it is its reality, its terrific meaning, which is emphasized and brought out.

We shall attempt but a word now on the second passage which tells us of the manner of the Lord's re-appearance, and which also requires to be taken carefully.

And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory (26).

Are not these words of a piece with the preceding language? To the Hebrews "clouds" stood for the media of any appearance of Deity. They meant a theophany. The prediction is that God will show Himself in Christ in that day; the Coming will be a veritable revelation of Him, and an actual visitation from Him. (The words have still more meaning than this, and we shall study them in a paper by themselves to interpret them as fully as may be. They go the closest to the question of how the Lord will come the second time, and warrant being stopped on. Meanwhile we shall understand them in the cursory way indicated, for the purpose of a summary of the chapter's meaning.)

To sum up what the "little apocalypse," whether it speaks of the Fall of Jerusalem or of the Return of the Lord, has to say of the latter. First of all, it is asserted that such a Return there will be. It is the Lord's own promise. The

apostles repeat the promise, just as the early Christians generally live in the expectation of His coming.

As for the time of the Coming, the early Christians had an intense and now pathetic hope of seeing the Lord's Return. In their expectation generally, as in that of the apostles, He was to come again soon, before that generation passed away at least (*Mark* xiii, 30); but Scripture leading decidedly away from this impression places the Coming after the arrival of certain conditions, like the evangelization of the world (*Matt.* xxiv, 14, *Mark* xiii, 10), and yet the existence of obscurity and lack of faith, and a fullness of iniquity (*Matt.* xxiv, 12, 13), together with unnamed upheavals and changes, at least as momentous as was the Fall of Jerusalem to its day—the day when these things should be, He Himself professing not to know (*Mark* xiii, 32, *Matt.* xxiv, 36).

As for the manner of the Coming, the Lord would come unexpectedly (*Mark* xiii, 33-36), in an actual revelation of Himself and a real visitation of men (26), with spiritual powers aiding Him (27), in a pervasive appearing (*Matt.* xxiv, 27), one that could be watched for (32-36) in the sense of being seen into and of being made ready for ethically, but not in the sense of being externally observable (*Luke* xvii, 20, *Mark* xiii, 21-23), or unavoidably seen (*Matthew* xxiv, 40, 41), though externally evidenced (*Matthew* xxiv, 30; cf. *Mark* xiii, 23, 28, 29). The Fall of Jerusalem seems meant to impress on disciples the momentous nature and the certainty of the Coming, as well as the fact that it will be groundlessly apprehended many times, as certainly it has been.

On the purpose of the Coming we can sum up even more briefly what the discourse gives us. As at the Fall of Jerusalem, the Lord's purpose will be judgment on spent religious forces and insight; and secondly, the institution of Christian life anew, as at the Fall of Jerusalem He moved to the institution of Christianity in the first instance.

In these summaries of meaning we have not assumed a

greater precision and definiteness in the predictions, we believe, than are there. In revelation itself forecasts of the future are general, and do not plot the future so that men cannot mistake it. The predictions remain in the realm of large suggestion. They fix the outlines of expectation in which the Coming will appear as a scene might stand out in a picture-frame. Into these expectations any idea we propose of the Coming should fit, if it is to answer to the Lord's own prevision, as contained in this discourse of *Mark* xiii. After considering more closely in the next paper what the coming with clouds tells us of the manner of the Advent, we shall consider how the idea of the Coming which these papers are interested to put forward, answers to these outlines of expectation.

William F. Wunsch.

MARRIAGE AND ITS RUIN,—A CHALLENGE TO US AS CHURCHMEN AND CITIZENS

By Asa E. Goddard

IN the middle of the last century slavery was a flourishing institution in this country. Many at the North as well as in the South were trying to find justification for it from Scripture and on other grounds. A second, and apparently much larger, class were totally indifferent to the subject, thinking that it did not affect them. A third class, clearly recognizing the wrong, contented themselves with doing nothing to prevent it, saying that the Lord would put an end to slavery at the proper time, and that men need not worry about it. If these three classes had embraced all the population, the curse would still remain among us. The Lord destroyed slavery, but he did it through human instrumentalities—by awakening in the hearts of those who were striving to live His law of love a sympathy for the oppressed, a righteous indignation against the injustice and cruelties practised upon many of the colored race, and a determination to stand upon the Lord's side even to the point of death. The fanaticism of John Brown, the burning story of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," the eloquence of William Lloyd Garrison, were among the influences employed by the Lord to mould a *public opinion* without which even the strength of a Lincoln would have labored in vain.

An even greater problem than that of slavery demands the best efforts of the twentieth century. Vices threatening the very vitals of Christianity and civilization are rampant among us. Until very recent years some of us men, and the vast majority of respectable women, have not realized

the magnitude of the danger confronting us, and have been more than willing in our ignorance to let the unsavory subject of divorce and its allied evils alone. The women, whose influence we so sorely need in upholding high ideals to the world, have either been kept in densest ignorance of the conditions about them, or have been fed upon the false doctrines of "physical necessity," "finding one's affinity," and other abominable stuff, until, now that they have attained their new-born freedom, they either do not know how to use it wisely, or are contributing even more than the men to certain phases of the evils we are to consider.

Let us look at some facts gathered from reliable sources.

In the United States divorce was almost unknown previous to the Civil War. In 1870 there was one divorce for six hundred and sixty-four marriages. In 1916, the last year for which statistics for the whole country are available, there was one divorce for every nine marriages. It has confessedly grown much worse since. In the city of Providence there was an increase of seventy-three per cent in divorce during the four years ending with 1920, thirty-four per cent of this representing the last year mentioned. During the first three months of 1923 Chicago averaged one divorce for every five marriages.

In England there were nearly six times as many divorces in 1920 as in 1913, and the number of cases in the United Kingdom was fifty per cent more in 1919 than in 1918. In Denmark the government has sanctioned trial marriages to be annulled if unsatisfactory. We forbear to speak of conditions in such countries as Germany and Russia, where nothing but a wide-spread break-down in private morality can be expected following the governmental sanction of revolting crimes.

Returning to our own country we find about nine-tenths of the cases uncontested, about the same ratio as in our own state; that the divorces granted to women are more than double those granted to men, and that this ratio is slowly but steadily increasing; that divorces granted to

women on account of the husband's adultery are only seven and a half per cent of the whole; that twenty per cent of the divorces granted to men are for the wife's adultery; for both husband and wife together in 1916 desertion stands first (36.8 per cent), cruelty second (28.3 per cent), and adultery third (11.5 per cent) among the alleged reasons. In South Carolina no divorce is granted; in New York adultery is the only valid cause; in Massachusetts there are seven grounds. In our whole country there are forty different codes on the subject of marriage and divorce.

In late years there has been a rapid increase in the number of divorces granted in states other than the one in which the parties reside, until now more than one-third (36.1 per cent) are thus obtained. Owing to the different laws in our states it is quite possible, as Judge Grant and one of our own lawyers have clearly shown, for a man to be considered either single, lawfully married, an adulterer, or a bigamist at one and the same time, depending simply upon which state he happens to be in at the moment; and thousands of women at the present time do not know whether they are lawfully living with their husbands. Of late years there has been a great increase of marriage by justices of the peace and other civil officers. By actual count considerably more than one-half of all the marriage ceremonies in Pinellas County, Florida, during the past year have been performed by notaries public and judges. A single justice of the peace in Brazil, Indiana, had an official record up to the time of his writing (February 27, 1923) of 7177 couples joined by himself. He has now made this his entire business, has fitted up his house elegantly with wedding parlor, reception room, and dressing room, with all conveniences to accommodate large or small parties, and advertises to marry any couple who will come to him with a marriage license at any hour of day or night any day in the year.

It is common knowledge in the legal profession that when a case is not to be contested (and nine-tenths of them are

uncontested), and especially when both parties are glad to separate, little dependence can be placed upon the alleged cause. Let me give a single example to illustrate. A lady who used to live only a few miles from here obtained a divorce from her husband several years ago. The only reason she gave her friends was most unusual—that her husband was too good, that she liked men better who were not always so exceedingly proper, who were a little more sporty. She went to Reno, Nevada, one of the worst pest-holes for this iniquitous business, and after a stay of six months obtained a divorce on the ground of desertion, returning to marry as soon as possible the man for whom she really obtained the divorce. Perhaps it is well in this particular case to add the sequel right here. The new husband, who had been so infatuated with her while she was another man's wife, could bear the unalloyed felicity of having her all his own about twenty-four hours, when he left for parts unknown—a case of *real* desertion this time. This, barring the sequel, may be considered in most respects a typical case for those who leave their own state to obtain separation (this alone covers more than one-third of all cases), and also for many who appeal to the courts in their own states. "It is quite the fashion," says Judge Grant, "to speak of being engaged to another man pending the procurement of the divorce." He and many other authorities tell us that desertion, the most frequent cause given, is merely to conceal the real cause, which may be mere incompatibility, or the most serious offence, or a desire to marry some one else. Mr. ———, a lawyer, says that he likes to help in procuring divorces because he is positive that in most cases he is making *four* people happy at the same time. Judge ———, of ———, who grants most of the divorces for his county, told the writer that perjury rarely stood in the way of one seeking divorce, if it was known that the case would be uncontested. Rev. Dr. ———, of the same city, who according to the court records has apparently officiated at more weddings than any other minister of the county, said

that in his efforts to fight divorce he had tried to appeal to a sense of loyalty to the state, when he found parties unwilling to accept the higher authority of Jesus Christ, but they only laughed in his face. Persons who have no respect for Divine law have no regard for human laws, except so far as they may be exposed to punishment. Disregard of the Lord's teachings on the subject of marriage and divorce is followed in a vast number of instances by breaking four at least out of the ten commandments,—false witness, coveting another's wife or husband, stealing another's wife or husband, and adultery. In these cases divorce involves adultery; and adultery is hell.

One reason why this evil has not been checked is that our separate states, and to a great extent the individuals of each state, have formed for themselves no fixed principles, or definite policy to work upon, and therefore there has been no concerted action. Like the nations of the earth, each state has been floundering about looking only to its own selfish interests, and suspicious of all the others. For more than thirty years commissioners, able men, have been appointed by the governors of the states to form a national code of laws covering marriage and divorce; but so far as I have learned not more than five states have ever agreed on any proposition advanced.

These difficulties and the conditions faced all grow out of the fact that there is no unanimity of thought among Christians, not even among the people of our own Church. Materialistic views are beginning to crowd out our old-time faith. Most of the articles written within our Church have stood squarely upon the Lord's own words: "What therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder," and "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery." These words were not spoken in parable, but in direct answer to a question. Many of our ministers and some of our laymen have contributed the best thought we

have found anywhere upon the subject. But occasionally we find something which can do only harm,—as the following, which appeared in the *Messenger* less than two years ago. After quoting "Three young men and three young women—hardly more than casual acquaintances—happened one day to pass the City Hall. On a sudden impulse one of the young men said, 'Let's go in and get married'; which they did," the writer goes on to say, "Had God joined them together? Would He have done so, even if they had gone to a minister instead? We find it difficult to think so." (See *New-Church Messenger* of Sept. 21, 1921, p. 176.) Why do such statements as these, so common in the world, produce a decided shock when seen in church literature? It is because they strike at the very fundamentals of spiritual progress,—an unwavering faith in Divine Providence, and the necessity of a constant struggle to do our part. Marriage is no longer a Divine institution, but merely a human contract, and therefore it can be annulled for other reasons than that given by the Lord. Compare this with other teachings of our Church, and we are forced to the following conclusions: we believe that Jesus Christ is God, but we don't believe what He says; we believe that His providence is over every act of our lives, even the most minute, but it doesn't apply to marriage; we accepted joyfully at our nuptials the sacred words of Scripture, "What, therefore, God hath joined together let not man put asunder" (Matt. 19, 6), but now God had no part in joining us together; we have been taught from childhood that marriage is the most sacred step in our lives, that we should prepare for it carefully and prayerfully all through our youth, striving to our utmost to make ourselves worthy of marriage, and relying upon the Lord's guidance in our choice, but now it appears to be a matter of little importance if acting upon the impulse of the moment we become united to a chance acquaintance. In another article (E. W. N., Oct. 26, 1921) we find: "In the cases where divorce is desired, God has had no part in joining the

parties." What is the use of such statements? Even if true, they could do no good. No decent man at the time of his marriage desires divorce, and if the desire comes later the reasoning is simply this: If we eat a good mushroom and we die, it was not a good mushroom; if we eat a good mushroom and thrive upon it, it was a good mushroom. Not very harmful, simply nonsensical. But I claim that the statement is absolutely false, and therefore decidedly harmful, *in what it implies.* The Lord is with us at all times and under all circumstances, even if we choose to make our bed in hell. He does not *wish,* of course, that we should do imprudent and foolish things; but He never deserts us even when we thwart His will. "There is with every man in every single moment a concurrence of more particulars of Providence than can be comprehended by any number. This I know from heaven" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 5894). "All things, even the least of all, to the very least of the least, are directed by the Providence of the Lord" (*Ibid.,* n. 6493). Ask any New-Churchman if he believes that Jesus Christ is God, and you will never hear a faltering answer. Ask him if it is incumbent upon us to obey His commandments, and he will tell you that that is the only way of life. But ask him if a churchman, a professed Christian, has a right to obtain divorce on any other ground than that given by our Lord, and you will be surprised to find how many stand upon rickety legs. Many, perhaps the majority, will answer firmly "No"; others will say that we ought to obey the laws of the state, or will give you some ingenious interpretation of Scripture allowing more or less laxity, or will quote prominent men in the church who by their words, or by their actions, or by both, have shown that they do not believe in a strict adherence to the words of the Lord. The writer has even been told that Swedenborg stood for divorce on a number of grounds, and that he would find them in "Conjugial Love." Another reading of that wonderful book from cover to cover since starting upon this article has convinced the author not only that Swedenborg says noth-

ing of the kind, but that he most emphatically supports the Scriptures. The precepts of the Lord are definite and clear. One may not with impunity tamper with them, or load them with home-made amendments and reservations. The duties of every married man and woman are three-fold: first, our duty to the Lord, in which we have absolutely no choice but to obey His commandment, "Thou shalt not"; second, our duty to the state and country, in which we have no choice except so far as our individual vote and influence may affect legislation; and third, our duties to each other, in which man and wife have equal rights and equal responsibilities, equal opportunities for ennobling and uplifting service.

While there are some real causes for grievances besides adultery, and some severe enough to make it best for the parties to separate temporarily, or even permanently, it is very evident that these cases are comparatively rare. The following are a few of the answers to questions put by the writer to those from whom he could obtain valuable help. A physician of forty-four years' experience said that he thought the real cause for divorce in all the cases that had come directly to his knowledge, or indirectly through fellow-physicians, was either adultery or pure selfishness, the latter frequently being a desire on the part of one or the other of the married couple to domineer over the other. A lawyer, who has had much work in this line of late years, said that barring the question of adultery he had never had a case that could not have been easily settled out of court, if the parties had been willing to use their common-sense, and make mutual concessions such as any one would consider reasonable in business transactions. A well-known judge of Probate Court, after telling of his occasional success in bringing parties together, and the happiness that he felt in so doing, said that he thought that influential friends, having knowledge of the troubles before the quarrelling had become a public scandal, often could, if they would, bring about a reconciliation; but that they frequently took sides in the matter, which only made things worse. This, as we

all know from abundant evidence, is a fundamental trouble in the well-known mother-in-law cases.

From much further testimony, too tedious to enumerate, it is evident that marital ties are regarded so lightly at the present time, that they are so frequently formed with the understanding that they are not necessarily to be considered permanent, that "we are in grave danger," as Judge Grant says, "of losing our national moral sense."

One of the most discouraging features one must contend with in treating of this subject is the perfectly senseless, self-satisfied, optimism so prevalent at the present time that it seems to be a part of the vicious propaganda emanating from depraved minds. Any one who has attempted to help in reforming the young knows how impossible it is to accomplish anything while the attitude is "I don't need to reform," or "I am a good deal better than some one else." Yet this pharisaical spirit is very evident when matters of sex relations are touched upon. "Oh, it is human nature, always has been and always will be; but just think how much better the world is to-day than it was centuries ago." The writer has been asked several times to compare present conditions with those of the Roman Empire. If one will carry this comparison a bit further, it will be more useful.* What caused the downfall of the Roman Empire but internal corruption, the most flagrant feature of which was the almost total disregard of any proper marital relations? By whom were the Romans overthrown? By the descendants of those *barbarians* who are thus described by Tacitus:

> They content themselves with one wife. Their matrimonial bond is strict and severe, and their manners in this respect deserving of the highest praise. Their life is one of fenced-in chastity. There is no arena with its seductions, no dinner-tables with their provocations, to corrupt them. There is no exchange of secret letters between men and women. Adulteries are very rare. Neither beauty, nor youth, nor wealth will bring a husband to an unchaste

* Compare marriage among the lower classes of the Romans with marriage among all classes of today.

> woman. No one laughs at vice there, or calls mutual seduction the way of the world. To limit the number of children is held abominable; and virtuous manners have there more efficacy than good laws elsewhere. . . . The children inherit the vigor of their parents.

This pagan life of the first century puts to shame the boasted civilization and Christianity of the twentieth, and makes us feel that unless we repent, "The kingdom of God will be taken from us, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."

Our duties in a broader way are naturally divided into two groups: the first, in our relation to the state and nation; the second, in our relation to the Lord and the Church. "Render, therefore, unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Every sincere churchman should be loyal to his government by obeying its laws, and assisting so far as his abilities and strength will admit in bettering those laws. We should join individually, and collectively through clubs and other organizations, in reform movements which have been already initiated, such as reducing the grounds for divorce in the several states to a few substantial ones, and aiming to obtain as soon as possible a uniform national law for both marriage and divorce. Applications for marriage and divorce in localities where neither party is known should be considered as prima facie evidence of attempt to defraud; and state attorneys should have as one of their most important duties the obligation to contest such cases as vigorously as they do burglaries and murders. A state which on the flimsiest of pretexts grants divorce to entire strangers encourages one of the worst vices known to man, is helping to breed a race of low-minded criminals, and is in the highest degree disloyal to the nation. The relations of man and wife are fundamental to society and to the state. Every hasty and improper marriage carries with it the possibility of untold misery on the moral, spiritual and physical planes. Venereal diseases have increased at an alarming extent since

easy divorces have become the order of the day, and venereal diseases furnish a large percentage of the inmates of hospitals for the insane. The children of divorced parents contribute a disproportionately large number to the inmates of houses of ill-fame. In one of our great western states it is estimated that 80 per cent of child delinquents are the offspring of divorced parents. (Howard Chandler Robbins in *The World Tomorrow,* April, 1923.) The time has come when the false reasoning so prevalent among our young people now should be effectually squelched. Their argument is essentially this: that a man and woman should be allowed to separate by mutual consent just as freely as they marry by mutual consent. But a man who has chosen to become a citizen of our country cannot renounce his citizenship at will. South Carolina was free to accept or reject a union with the other twelve original states, but having once united she could not secede. The interests of the country as a whole are paramount to those of any individual or component group.

We can even learn from the animal world important lessons from a strict monogamy. Ernest Thompson Seton, in his "The Natural History of the Ten Commandments," after giving many interesting illustrations, tells us that on the whole animals succeed, avoid disease and spread, and are high in the scale in proportion as they approach the ideal union (monogamy). Gray wolves, for example, strictly observe monogamy; they eliminate disease, and defy extermination. He remarks that even man cannot break down the monogamy of pigeons; and he quotes Gadow as calling them "the birds of the future." Incidentally he makes the following statement:

> There is evidence that in the animal world there has long been a groping after an ideal form of marriage. Beginning with promiscuity, they have worked through many stages into pure monogamy; and other things being equal, the species, owing to natural laws, are successful in proportion as they have reached it, and therefore have developed an instinctive recognition of the seventh commandment.

Every one of us can perform a distinct service to the state and nation by showing our disapproval and opposing in every way the performance of such theatricals and movies as present broken engagements, running away with other men's wives, and indecent suggestions. Many of the popular novels, too, should be tabooed as presenting low ideals of marriage and its responsibilities.

But the distinctive service of the Church—its fundamental use—is in the formation of such a spiritual character as will enable one to see the exalted place that marriage holds in the Divine purpose, and will make him strive to attain that place. The Church can show that every practical problem connected with married life—how to prepare for marriage, the dangers to be avoided before and during married life, how to cope successfully with the temptations which are sure to rise, the intimate and essential connection of marriage and religion, the distinctive responsibilities assumed by Christians, and the distinctive opportunities for help open to them, etc., etc.—can be answered plainly by a careful study of the Word and the writings of Swedenborg. Manifestly only a few of the most essential points can be considered in the limits of this paper, and those few are chosen which seem to deal most effectively with those particular forms of selfishness most likely to end in divorce. We are told that Rev. John Worcester, on starting one of his classes in "Conjugial Love," introduced the subject in these words: "This is the practical handbook of the New Church. The whole aim and tendency of it is to deliver from evil and to lead into good." From this work naturally most of the quotations will be taken.

Concerning preparation for marriage we find the following significant statements:

If you wish to be led by the Divine Providence, employ prudence as a servant. (Divine Providence, n. 210.)

Interiors of mind and body are burnt out when a man and woman precipitate marriage without order, by not looking to the Lord, by not consulting reason, by rejecting betrothment, and obeying the flesh only. (Conjugial Love, n. 312.)

A woman ought to consult her parents, or those who are in place of parents, and then to deliberate with herself before she consents to marriage. (*Ibid.*, nn. 298, 299.)

Conjugial pairs are born and educated for marriage, both being ignorant of it. (*Ibid.*, n. 316.)

Separations often take place after death because of narrow choice here, and new conjunctions are made with similar and homogeneous, *unless* they have been provided on earth, which is done for those who from an early age have loved, have wished, and have asked of the Lord, a legitimate and lovely conjunction with one, and have scorned and shunned wandering lusts. (*Ibid.*, n. 49.)

From the above we learn, that entering upon marriage without proper preparation is actually sinful; that prudence on our part must accompany trust in the Lord; that by a combination of prudence and trust we are preparing for a permanent union hereafter; and that if our characters have been sufficiently purified before marriage we shall begin our permanent union here.

The question, Is divorce (for any cause except adultery) and subsequent marriage wrong? finds answer in the following passages:

Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.

And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication; and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery. (Matt. xix, 8-9.)

In commenting upon these verses Swedenborg says:

He says that Moses permitted, in order that it may be known that it was not the Lord. (Conjugial Love, n. 340.)

The sole cause of divorce is scortation, according to the Lord's commandment in Matt. xix, 9. . . . He says, if he shall put away, and marry another, except for whoredom, he commits adultery, because the putting away for this cause is a plenary separation of minds, which is called divorce; but the rest of the puttings away from their causes are separations, concerning which it has just been treated above; after these, if another wife is married, adultery is committed; but not after divorce. (*Ibid.*, n. 255, and similarly in 468.)

That the matrimony contracted is to endure to the end of life in the world, is from Divine law; and because it is from this, it is also from rational law; and thence from civil law. (*Ibid.*, n. 276, and similarly in 261 ff.)

From the above passages we find that Swedenborg, in commenting upon the verses in Matt xix, stands squarely behind the Lord's words; and in other places also he shows that marriage should be a life contract. Any re-marriage except after the death or adultery of one's partner means for a genuine Christian the breaking of the seventh commandment.

The following causes of coldness and separation need to be borne in mind by everyone:

For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife. (Matt. xix, 5.)

No one can ever truly conjugially love his consort, who from the love of self is in the pride of his own intelligence. (Conjugial Love, n. 193.)

The love of dominion of one over the other entirely takes away conjugial love and its heavenly delight. . . . Dominion subjugates, and a subjugated mind has either no will, or an opposite will; if it has no will, it has also no love; and if it has an opposite will, there is hatred instead of love. (Heaven and Hell, n. 380.)

The first of the internal causes of colds is rejection of religion by both. . . . The second . . . is, that one has religion and the other has not (Conjugial Love, nn. 240, 241.)

"A universal interior cause of coldness is the love of evil, especially the love of whoredom." (Swedenborg's abstract of Conjugial Love.)

The above clearly point out the greatest dangers in the way of marital happiness; namely,—listening to the advice of relatives and friends in opposition to the married partner; worshipping intellect; the love of dominion; the self-satisfied feeling that one can choose safely his own course without the help of church or any religion; and lastly, the positive love of evil implanted in the natural man.

The terrible nature of adultery is emphasized in many ways:

The natural man, from the delight of evil implanted by nativity

in the natural man, confirms himself that there is nothing against the allurements of the body, fights against conjugial love, and as conqueror destroys the camp of conjugial love with himself from the outmosts to the inmosts. (Conjugial Love, n. 426.)

All hell abounds in uncleannesses, and the universal origin of these is impure and obscene scortatory love. (*Ibid.*, n. 430.)

When man commits adultery from delight, heaven is closed to him; which being closed, he no longer acknowledges the Divine, nor anything of the faith of the Church. (Heaven and Hell, n. 384.)

Conjugial love shuns the evil of adultery as the destruction of the soul, of the public weal, and of the body. (Conjugial Love, n. 130.)

The whole hell is called adultery, and the whole heaven is called marriage. (*Ibid.*, n. 520.)

It would be most interesting to know whether every one who has tried earnestly and prayerfully to make himself worthy of marriage has not at some time directly felt the guiding of the Divine Providence. We have all known, some perhaps several times, some strong attractions on the natural plane, attractions of beauty, grace, brilliant intellect, etc. False prophets come before us, and almost persuade us that they are Christ. We are powerfully impelled to follow their dictates. Then is the time for us to pray in the closets of our hearts for guidance, that we may know that our desire comes from all that is deepest and purest and best of those affections planted by the Lord in the inmosts of our souls, and then to rest content till we feel that guidance. When it does come, we *know* it. It cannot be described in words. We feel that it is too sacred to mention. We feel the beginning of a soul-union, and experience a hitherto unknown peace. We realize more or less perfectly those unions in heaven, where, as Browning expresses it, "they know themselves into marriage." It is "the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes." Now prepare for temptations, which are sure to come after every deep experience in life. Form the unalterable resolution that come what will, we will never doubt the Lord's voice once distinctly heard and recognized. He has taught us

Himself plainly how to meet these temptations. You remember how He, after His final consecration for His ministry, coming up out of the water in prayer, was met by the tempter, and how unhesitatingly He met the temptation with all the power of His Holy Word. He has thus shown us how to meet the temptations of married life in just as summary and effective a manner. In Matt. v, 28-32, we are taught not simply what is adultery and what is the only ground of divorce, but we are taught as distinctly as the language of correspondence can teach just how to meet the temptations to these evils. "If thy right eye causeth thee to stumble, pluck it out and cast it from thee. . . . If thy right hand causeth thee to stumble, cut it off and cast it from thee." As these words come directly between the teachings about adultery and divorce, they were evidently meant to apply to the temptations of married life. Swedenborg, in "Apocalypse Explained," n. 600, shows us that this means that evils must be rejected from the *thought* and also from the *affection,* or the whole man must perish. If the truth were known, many of us, perhaps all, have been sorely tempted after marriage to feel at times that marriage is a failure. We are tempted with discouragement because we have so imperfectly done our part; in our more self-assertive moments we blame our partner. The mote in the other's eye seems very large; or the beam in our own eye seems to threaten total blindness. Here is the danger point. This is the time not to be impatient with ourselves, but to be intolerant of the evil spirit seeking to control us. "Get thee hence, Satan." And Satan goes; and we are blessed with an abundance of peace.

The intimate and essential connection of true marriage and religion is shown in the following:

> Whosoever does not regard adulteries as sins in faith and life is not a Christian, neither has he any religion. . . . Whosoever shuns adulteries as sins . . . has religion; and if he be in the Christian Church, is a Christian. (Doctrine of Life, n. 77.)

Angels of the Copper Age told Swedenborg that their fathers

had taught them: "Sons, if you wish to love God and your neighbor, and if you wish to grow wise to eternity, we counsel you to live married to one wife; if you recede from this precept, *every heavenly love* will fly from you." (Conjugial Love, n. 77.)

Now it is plain that a Christian—because he knows the Lord and has the Word—has, more than a man not a Christian, the faculty of being regenerated, and so of becoming spiritual; and also of attaining love truly conjugial, for they go together. (*Ibid.*, n. 339.)

Live these laws not only as civil and moral, but also as Divine laws, and you will be a spiritual man. (Divine Providence, n. 322.)

On the effect of marriage love in hereditary ways upon offspring, we find the following significant passage:

The offspring born of two who are in love truly conjugial derive from their parents the conjugial principle of good and truth, from which, when they are sons, they derive the inclination and faculty of perceiving those things which are of wisdom, and when they are daughters of loving the things which wisdom teaches. (Abstract of Conjugial Love.)

The grand end of creation is a heaven from the human race. In addition to the procreating of offspring, the part that marriage love is intended to perform in carrying out the Divine purpose is inconceivably great. It is a prime factor in the putting down of self, and in strengthening each other in the highest form of loyalty of which we are capable—the loyalty of husband and wife to each other, which, in its fullness, is at the same time the truest loyalty to the state and nation, and loyalty to God. Marriage love is the foundation of every good love by which our discipleship is tested. It is implanted by the Lord himself in the soul of everyone who in His name puts down all lustful thoughts. In its holiness and purity lies the safeguard of the Christian religion itself. Without it there can be no lasting love of the Lord and the neighbor, and conscience itself will gradually lose its corrective and directive power. Those who are fortunate enough to be blessed with children may know that they will be predisposed to the wise and lovely things of life just in proportion to the faithfulness of the parents to their marriage vows.

Astronomy was practically at a standstill until the establishment of the Copernican Theory, making the sun, rather than the earth, the center of our system. Then followed the wonderful laws of Kepler, explaining the motions of all the planets, which no ingenious system of cycles and epicycles had been able to solve. It took a Newton to prove that these laws were dependent upon the general law of gravitation. Then followed the study of the mighty center, the sun, till all astronomers finally agreed that it is the source of all the energies in the material world. When the spiritual Copernican Theory is adopted, not only as a theory, but as the most vital truth,—that the Lord Jesus Christ is the source and sustainer of all our spiritual forces, —then, and not till then, will mankind cry out in prayer to the only true God, and slake their thirst in the living waters which alone can restore the soul.

Every one in the New Church is familiar with Swedenborg's Rules of Life, the first of which was, "Diligently to read and meditate upon the Word of God," and the second, "To be content with the dispensations of Divine Providence." It would be interesting to know how many have made a practical use of these rules in striving to make themselves worthy of marriage, or have thought of their influence upon Swedenborg himself. It is known that he in early manhood met with disappointment in love, and suffered as only those of sterling character can suffer. It cast such a gloom over his early life that he vowed never again to allow himself to fall in love—a vow which he religiously kept all through his long, chaste and noble life. Can we who have received the priceless legacy of his theological works doubts for one instant that one of the prime factors in the preparation for his great mission was this soul-reaching experience, developing an unfaltering trust and opening his heart to heavenly influences! Let us think of him at the ripe old age of fourscore years sitting at his desk, with his Rules of Life always before him, composing the most marvelous treatise upon marriage love ever con-

ceived by man, and let us consider his beautiful expression, as shown in his portraits, and described by those who came in close contact with him in life, bespeaking the wonderful intelligence and inward peace of one who has spent his life in the Lord's service. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

When we feel disheartened by the low ideals of marriage prevailing in the world to-day, let us revive our courage and gain new inspiration from the teaching of Swedenborg that marriage love, which had become almost extinct in his day, is capable of being raised up again, and surely will be raised up again. (Conjugial Love, nn. 78, 81.) What greater service can our Church perform in this hour of need than to proclaim the sacredness of this love, and to spread broadcast that blessed message of hope that it is to come again and purify the world?

"Love truly conjugial, which is that of one man and one wife, from its origin and from its correspondence is heavenly, holy, clean above every love." (Conjugial Love, n. 346.) It is the fundamental love from which all other good loves are derived (*Ibid.*, n. 65). It is from the Lord only, and is given to those who live according to His precepts (*Ibid.*, n. 534). It "is the precious pearl of human life, and the repository of the Christian religion" (*Ibid.*, n. 457). In it is the inmost of conscience (*De Conjugium*). All who are in love truly conjugial are in love towards the Lord, because it descends from the marriage of the Lord with the Church (*Ibid.*).

A little boy was the bearer of the following message delivered to Swedenborg in the other world:

> Tell the inhabitants of the earth with whom you are, that there is given love truly conjugial, the delights whereof are myriads, scarcely any of which the world yet knows; but it will know when the Church espouses herself to her Lord and is married. (Conjugial Love, n. 293.)
>
> And I, John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. (Rev. xxi, 2.)

Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honor to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. (Rev. xix, 7.)

Let us adopt as our slogan of today the inspiring words of Isaiah to the Church, uttered 2600 years ago:

Awake, awake, put on thy strength, O Zion; put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city; for henceforth there shall no more come into thee the uncircumcized and the unclean. (Is. lii, 1.)

What man who has ever felt deep affection can fail to be strengthened by sacred memories of his own experiences as he contemplates the wondrous beauty of the symbolic marriage of the Lord and the Church. It is the sacred obligation of every church member, and especially of every parent, to hold before the youth of the church, that this "precious pearl of human life" is at some time or other, in this world or the next, offered to every one on the single invariable condition of keeping the Commandments.

The presence of the Lord is just as real to-day as in the time of the apostles, if we only open our hearts to receive Him. His life is continuously "broadcasted" throughout this and every other world; and our duty is to provide a proper receiving set, attuned to catch the unselfish vibrations of His love. Then we shall hear the Divine voice speaking with authority in the silence of the soul:

I am the way, and the truth and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me.

If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in His love.

If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you.

Mountains of self-love can be removed and cast into the sea, but only in *His* name. The mind can be illumined to make the right choice at every turn in life, but the enlightenment is from the *Holy Word*—a lamp unto our feet, and a light unto our path. The hardest trials and the severest

sufferings can be transformed into a perfect and enduring peace, but it is the peace of Him who giveth *not as the world giveth.*

Heavenly Father, increase our faith; teach us, and lead us and strengthen us to do *Thy will.*

Asa E. Goddard.

THE STUDY OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE.*

By the Rev. Jacob Emanuel Werren

THERE are signs now and then that the Hebrew language is awakening a new interest; and many will ask, "Do you know anything about this new work, 'The Hebraic Tongue Restored'?" There is not a little confusion with regard to this ancient tongue. Some think it is too difficult a subject for ordinary readers, while some authorities would assure the world that Hebrew is the simplest, most interesting language, that it throws the clearest light upon all language, and that it should be taught the young as early as possible.

Opinions may vary touching the more abstract question of linguistry in general; but the study of Hebrew is emphasized more particularly because efforts within and without the Church to get more intimately near the real meaning of Semitic speech in the Sacred Scriptures, are stressing the need of such knowledge. The multiplying versions, and especially their striking variations from one another, even in most simple and familiar passages, lead many to utter the cry, "Why can't these men stop tinkering with the Bible? Why can't an authoritative and final version be made that will end forever these confusing variations?"

It was the great objection to the famous Polyglot of Walton and others, that such works undermined faith, because they exhibited on every page variations that made it

* *The Hebraic Tongue Restored,* and the True Meaning of the Hebrew Words Re-established and Proved by Their Radical Analysis. By Fabre D'Olivet. Done into English by Nayán Louise Redfield. New York. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1921. 16+471+346 pages, 8vo. Cloth, $15.00 net.

impossible to believe that such contradictions had any right to the claim of presenting the Word of God. The cry against the multiplying versions in our day is precisely of the same nature; and from the position of those who have no means of knowing the more intimate character of the variations, and no opportunity of forming an independent judgment for approaching the true sense of the Divine Word, the cry is the more pitiful, since the study of Hebrew by the clergy has been characterized as getting "antique furniture" for the Church, and has been largely replaced by modernities that leave the heart-yearnings unfed.

Unfortunate it is, indeed, that specialists to whom the linguistic study of the Scriptures seems left, are losing the once confident trust of the simple; because from the volumes unfolding their learning, negative principles, scientific doubt, and the like seem to show that such wisdom gives no spiritual light, and affords no help toward meeting the difficulties to which an honest, simple life is exposed. No wonder that many of those who are seeking for a purer light are resorting to one kind or other of modern occultism, where they too easily are led to think they are getting hold of a spiritual help, when they are more than likely the dupes of men, and the prey of misinterpreted deceptions.

In many an unlooked-for corner earnest souls are taking up by themselves the means of getting nearer to the spiritual meaning of the Sacred Word; and the study of Hebrew that looks to a deeper sense is a welcome refuge, where they can pursue it untrammeled by the doubt-breeding materialism that lingers behind scientific assertions.

If Fabre D'Olivet's Hebrew Grammar is—as is truthfully asserted—"a hundred years behind the times" (having first appeared from Paris in 1815), there must be some reason for its re-publishing in 1921. There must be more than mere curiosity that went to the trouble of translating (going on to a thousand pages) from the French into English. To establish it is the purpose of this review of the work done by Nayán Louise Redfield.

An older set of ministers who tried to get *something* out of the dry study of Hebrew, gladly resorted to the grammar and apparatus of D'Olivet. His enthusiasm, his simple but exquisite French, and the novelty of his method, all combined to win for his work a glad welcome from the past generation; and a like appreciation is expected for its appearance in an English dress. So far as it helps to increase the light from the Word, and to give aid to those who look for it in Revelation, one can but wish it abundant success.

The "old" grammar has not changed very much in the translation. From many, however, to whom French is more of a foreign tongue to-day than it was in the older days to those with whom it served as a common medium of intercourse as between nations in the general language of diplomacy, cordial thanks will go to the translator who has with so great care accomplished the laborious undertaking of "Englishing" such a work and carried it through so successfully. One may find, in sections, the fascinating, idiomatic style of the original author, and appreciate his wonderful enthusiasm for the subject to which he was so thoroughly devoted.

It would be too much to expect in a translation so intimate an absorption of the subject that the version might be taken as the translator's own. So here there are peculiarities which make it immediately evident that one is reading another's thought through the translator. A salient specimen is found in the title "The Hebraic Tongue." *Hebraique* in the French title *La Langue Hebraique* is plainly the feminine form of the adjective *Hebreu,* and *Hebreu* simply means "Hebrew." It has the other meaning, "Hebraic," which includes anything having reference to what belongs to that people, age, or, as here, the language. There are many languages, as Samaritan, Syriac, Chaldee, Arabic, etc., which are part of, and intimately related to Hebrew, and are therefore of an "Hebraic" type. But Fabre D'Olivet is not intending to restore all these members of the one group, but—though using part of their literature in

his illustrations and explanations—is evidently concerned only about the language of Moses, which is Hebrew, and not Hebraic. The translator does in this case not translate, but through the use of a homophone introduces a squinting sense that does not necessarily exist in French. Fabre D'Olivet in this whole work is treating of the *Hebrew Language,* and not of "Hebraic" speech in general. While, therefore, "hebraic" looks more like *hebraique,* it does not in the translation correctly represent it. This use of a like-sounding word for a foreign word is apparently a habit of the translator, for it is found in various parts of the work. Yet this singularity is hardly observable except by readers of the French, and would barely be noticed in English.

But where excellencies are so many, it is not desirable to dwell on trifles that may after all appear as individual views and judgments. The volume is worthy of praise both on account of its faithful translation, and its elegant presentation by the printers—a joy to handle, and a pleasure to use.

There is no particular need at this time to enter a minute description of the work itself, as it shares characteristics that are common property to works of linguistry in general. Like others this treatise of the Hebrew language has a portion devoted to forms (a grammar and a radical lexicon), another to matters literary (a text to which the doctrine of forms is applied).

Fabre D'Olivet, however, presents in this grammar a new view which is to a certain extent too condensed to be always perfectly clear. He has imbibed the teachings of Court de Gebelin, who in a work of eight royal octavos volumes, has treated of innumerable aspects of intellectual beginnings and developments in the human race. His work has the general title *Le Monde Primitif.* Three volumes deal with linguistic beginnings, in which the elements are displayed that appear to have awakened Fabre D'Olivet to his work. The three volumes are condensed into a few pages in the "Hebraic Tongue," and at times leave the impression of

leaps and breaks that account for seemingly arbitrary conclusions. Aside from these, Fabre D'Olivet presents an "old subject" in so strikingly "new forms," that it seems surprising that he has been "left alone"—neither attacked nor defended much in public. As in the case of Court de Gebelin, his star seems to have shone most over France, and set there.

It is not the age of the subject, nor the personal method in which he treats it, that makes the appearance of this monumental translation important. Grammars have to be written out, forms displayed, demonstrations applied; but there is one thing which distinguishes this work on the Hebrew language most readily from any other Hebrew grammar. D'Olivet refers a few times to the state of the Hebrew studies in modern days. He sincerely regrets the Procrustean bed, on which they drop or stretch the poor Semite in order to make him fit into the state of linguistry to-day. True it is that, although heaping much detail upon the ancient servant, there has been no advancement that has made it more clear to modern readers what was the real ancient wisdom, or made it more helpful to the deep needs of our trying days.

Here is a study of the Hebrew language that is full of a genuine enthusiasm, and a conviction that it is possible to make its pursuit interesting and truly helpful. In language terse, simple, clear, and confident it follows the spirit of human development in its literary remains to what seems the source through which the inmost secrets of the race are observable. Curious, how a part of the human race has always suspected, and looked for, hidden riches in the depths of the soul, and has been stirred to it by those collected writings bearing the name of "Sacred Scripture"! And curious, too, on the other hand, how with the acquisition of more intimate knowledge of his surroundings, man has gained a confidence in himself in which secrets and mysteries of all kinds become part of the ignorance that veils the confines of knowledge! But such is the fact in the

field that Fabre D'Olivet has deliberately chosen to illuminate. This has been the reason of the attraction his *"Langue Hebraique Restituee"* has exercised from the beginning, causing its readers to exclaim that it was like a refreshing spring in a dry and parched region.

How simple the method by which he gains the attention of such readers as are looking for steps to the inner, hidden riches! The way he leads is entered by getting out of complexities into paths of simplicity; out of the confusion of artful life into the openness of childhood as it were. The photographic detail to which modern linguistic art descends breeds specialists who live apart from the world, and sometimes appear not to care to be a part of it. Fabre D'Olivet is a humanitarian, and wishes his efforts to result in lifting the human race into new sunshine and a brighter day. Here is his method. He has only one aim: to find his simplicity in the oldest writings of the world, in the *Sepher of Moses* (*Sepher* is the Hebrew name for "book").

Led by Court de Gebelin (whom he follows as a great leader, for he is acknowledged as "a noted French scholar," to which estimate another author adds the term "celebrated," a characterization to which the encyclopædic knowledge displayed in the eight volume *"Monde Primitif"* surely entitled him), D'Olivet accepts the important assumption that Moses, having been educated in the royal Egyptian schools, presented in his *Sepher* Egyptian rather than Semitic learning. Four hundred years' sojourn in Egypt was sufficient, in the eyes of these and of many other scholars, for the Hebrews to assimilate Egyptian knowledge, and for it to become paramount in the captive race.

The analysis of the Hebrew language showed it as akin to the Egyptian; that, like the latter, it was a language of *sign*-writing; and in this *sign* element he found the great basis and foundation of the language of the *Sepher of Moses*. This great "find" was what fired D'Olivet's enthusiasm; and it runs like a scarlet thread through the length of his almost monumental work. His *signs* are what we

now know as letters. In the beginning they were not letters, but pictures of things, each being therefore essentially a noun, mainly the noun indicated by its name,—as *aleph* man, *beth* the mouth of man, *ghimel* the throat, etc., etc.

By combination of two signs with a vowel between, or of a sign with a vowel and two consonants following, *roots* are formed, which become the "generative ideas" of language. The prime need, therefore, in studying Hebrew by Fabre D'Olivet's method, is to imbibe carefully what the signs themselves mean, and what the meaning of each may be, as an *idea* in the combination of signs as roots.

The subject is complicated by the additional conception, that each sign and each root has not only a literal, but also a figurative, and a hieroglyphic sense. These the author develops by a mechanism of interpretation exceedingly unique, but which few students would find themselves independent enough to apply, if they should undertake the continuation of D'Olivet's work beyond his tenth chapter.

We would once more call attention to this *sign* and the formation of signs into *roots* that constitute the chief attraction in this "Hebraic Tongue." There is in this pursuit a *line of principle* followed out, which, right or wrong, commends itself to students who are tired of being driven through Hebrew as a purely modern tongue.

I have tried to point out the great significant essential in this Hebrew method, because I share the pleasure of those who are tired of mere mechanism in linguistry, and who have found a way to a more living knowledge of the Mosaic writings. But I also share with the many who have "dropped Fabre D'Olivet" the doubt, how far it is, after all, right to adopt, and propagate this theory of the Egyptian origin of the Pentateuch, either in whole or in part.

As to the origin of the Hebrew, and its derivation from the Egyptian hieroglyph, my first doubt was aroused when I found how scholars of greatest fame can themselves be led into monstrous falsity, and by propagating it unconsciously, lead in barricading the way of truth. I allude to

Delitzsch's great lecture on *"Babel und Bibel,"* where he thought he completely demonstrated that Moses borrowed his oldest tales from the Babylonian records without giving due credit. This he thought he proved by the plain calculation, that the Babylonian cuneiform records were from 1000 to 1500 years older and therefore more original than the books of Moses. Hence Delitzsch's conclusion, that for the earliest Biblical tales we must go to Babylon as the source.

To brand the Biblical stories as "cribbing from Babylonian sources," while the Scripture accuses Babylonian tales as from the "mother of confusion," was indeed a hazardous undertaking. Its disclosure was therefore reserved for the ears of great specialists, and of royalty; and only gradually did it reach the great ear of the world. Since the promulgation of *"Babel und Bibel"* the great scholar's view has worn itself tired because of a still greater wonder that has arisen,—the miracle that a great Semitic wave far anterior to the time of the arrow-headed clay-tablets, had transformed the Babylonian world into a Semitic colony, whose tales of the Creation, the flood, etc., are not Babylonian originals but Babylonian echoes of Semitic tales and early influences that gave the Babylonians a permanent language and civilization.

As the Assyro-Babylonian age is posterior to a Semitic wave (which is not to be mistaken for, nor to be identified with, the Israelitish civilization), so will it be possible to determine the relative ages of Semiticism and the Nile valley's earlier inhabitants. The question, "Which writing is older, the Genesis accounts or the Egyptian hieroglyphs?" has never had a consideration that settles it beyond a doubt. The "scientific" considerations have not proceeded beyond mere "impressions," "reasonable guesses," or improved assertions. It matters not how "high" the "authority" that makes any deposition as a discovery in scientific aspects, if the demonstration does not ultimately reach the "mass" of intelligence. Since the early declaration that Egyptian pic-

ture-writing must be the first, if not the primitive, stage of that human art, that view has made no progress toward a general acceptance, merely because it is nothing more than an unproved surmise. It is lacking that fundamental need, where personal eye-witness cannot be consulted, the principle that fits into a series that makes a law.

Is there such a fit principle upon which both Semitic and Nile script take their serial positions and relations? This is not the place to undertake an extensive demonstration (which should be given elsewhere); and a few bare "assertions" must suffice at this time.

First,—The Hebrew Language has not, as yet, had any adequate consideration. Like a thing that people do not know what to do with, Hebrew writing has been thrown on the linguistic dump.

Second,—In many ways a most puzzling script, it has always been placed at the end of a series of Semitic "alphabets." The preference of age has been given to the script of language that has practically no literature—I mean, the Phœnician,—whose nation comes up quite late in the general Semitic age. The generally accepted idea, that the present Hebrew alphabet is the Chaldee alphabet and not Hebrew at all, is based upon a misinterpretation in a tradition that the Hebrew script was changed into the Chaldee (*m'Ashshurith*); whereas the expression really means that it was made into the Assyrian style, that is, all the letters were made of approximately the same height, as the cuneiform writing looks,—thus changing the *looks* of the ancient Hebrew script, without necessarily altering the individual letters to any considerable degree. This interpretation leaves the present Hebrew letters as a very ancient writing, and explains why investigators have pursued wrong clues.

Third,—A beginning has been made by such persistent scholars as Court de Gebelin and his successor Fabre D'Olivet, to give up the senseless explanation of the present Hebrew letters (as, that *aleph* means an *ox, beth* a *house, ghimel* a *camel,* etc.), and to start a new series, wherein

aleph means the *human being, beth* the *organ of speech, ghimel* the *throat,* etc. These gentlemen blazed a new track; but unfortunately they did not get hold of its principle, that *the Hebrew letters rest altogether on the human being.* Yet this principle can be demonstrated as a fact.

Fourth,—While following one tradition, it was not so easy (especially if the Egyptian origin of Hebrew letters be true) to pick up the other (rabbinic, it is true, but not therefore to be rejected as merely fanciful), that every Hebrew letter was nothing else than a composition of the simplest letter, the *yodh,* or in the abstract a *wave-line,* or *flame-line.* This element appears in every Hebrew letter (as three times in א, twice in ב, etc.), the positions of the "yodhs" and their number (for instance, one oblique and two vertical in the א, etc., etc.) constituting the letter in question. This makes the agreement with the Assyro-Babylonian the more striking, for that script proceeds upon a similar principle, using the straight line as the element. The line as vertical, horizontal, or oblique is known from the little triangle or *wedge* (that gives it the name "cuneiform"). Assyro-Babylonian and the Semitic scripts are therefore surprisingly similar, their letters being formed by repeating the one sign, in which the number and position help to define each "letter."

But which is the older?

If the Semitic uses the flame-element only, who cannot see that *the straight line is the line of light* whose range is confined and limited to *one* path? Every ray of light has at its center a core of heat, which makes light the offspring and descendant from heat; and of the two, heat is the original, and its representative (the wave-line in Semitic script) is the original in writing.

Fifth,—With regard to the Egyptian writing, this has stopped at the representation of the thing itself. It has not proceeded to the choice of a principle. Its lines are mixed, in arrested development. Both Semitic and Assyro-Babylonian writing point to a superior civilization; and the pres-

ence of Israelites in Egypt shows them as not free, captives, among the lower autonomous rulers.

The historic consideration of the various ancient scripts shows Semitic, or its descendant Hebrew, the *oldest of any known writing.*

The reversal of order in Fabre D'Olivet, making the Nile valley the apex of civilization, is from a tendency of holding the Israelites still captive among the Egyptians. It is undoubtedly a very strong reason why the scholarship of Frenchmen has not been able to convince the world against Scripture testimony—for is it not said among other things:

> In that day shall there be a highway out of Egypt to Assyria, and the Assyrian shall come into Egypt, and the Egyptian into Assyria, and the Egyptians shall serve with the Assyrians. In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the land: whom the Lord of hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt, my people, and Assyria, the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance. (Isa. xix, 21-25.)

These are reasons why the broader study of Hebrew led the present reviewer to abandon the authority of Fabre D'Olivet as to his principles relating to forms. It is another question, how the principles laid down should be used to serve as a basis for a rational Hebrew grammar. The summary dismissal of the "Massorah" from the customary text must to any one seem an arbitrary performance. The accents *are* there, the stops; the application of a vowel-system *is* there, as well as the naked, literal text. They are evidence of a gradual growth in definition of the text, whose history should surely not be simply neglected. The tri-literal roots even have a certain aspect of having a right to be considered as having a place.

As with the stroke of a pen, Fabre D'Olivet wipes all these things out, and begins his consideration of the formation of the Hebrew root with the assertion:

> A root is, and can never be anything but, monosyllabic: it results from the union of two signs at the least, and of three at the most. . . . Every word composed of more than one syllable is

necessarily a derivative. For two roots are either united or contracted; or else one or several signs have been joined to the radical root for its modification.

While uniquely supported by his individual treatment, Fabre D'Olivet's method is interesting indeed, but will remain his personal view, and in that measure will fail of universal acceptance.

A rational Hebrew grammar that may lay a larger claim to a general acceptance is a faint hope of many who are interested in the perennial value of the most ancient of languages. It will call for a logical history of Semitic literature, culminating in the Masoretic text. It will step from the present tradition of the *accented text* to the distinctly older *vocalized* state of the same text. Nor will such history fail to dismantle the senseless interpretation of a Samaritan age and text being original to the Semitic. Again a proper consideration of the Hebrew vowel-system will throw a more complete light on the question whether the "Hebrew alphabet" has ever served to furnish vowel-letters to the text as a first of a vocalized text. It will also answer unequivocally the question, whether ever a vowelless text existed, or could exist.

That grammar, finally, will tackle *the original unvowelled* text, and show its nature as an *ideographic* state of the language, whose elements are the present twenty-two "letters." This small body of original elements has never yet had any rational consideration. The present attempt at an interpretation of their ancient origin and meaning seems worse than guesswork. Language is too magnificent a subject, embracing as it does the whole human race, to end in a mixture of trivial things where windows, nails, doors and artificial objects are supposed to figure before their existence, and where oxen, camels, serpents, fishes, seem to express wisdom in which human beings have vainly succeeded in discovering secrets quenching the blind thirst for mysteries.

A more noble effort to discover worthy foundation in

the present "alphabet" has been *started* by Court de Gebelin (D'Olivet's forerunner), but not carried through, for want of a bottom-principle. To a greater extent than most scholars, he has found a *human element in the letters.* But abandoning that human for a *merely natural* element, he has lost the *rational* trail. Language does not begin with nature, whose elements must be analyzed and interpreted; it begins with *man.* Without the emphasis of this truly human element, the start and origin of language can be hunted for in Egypt, or in China, but will forever elude detection. Nor will the consideration of the human element avail without that further profundity, that *man* is essentially *a spiritual being,* endowed with endless life and perpetual development. This valuation of his being will set man at the apex of a series where dead matter, organized matter, and organism as a form of life—or what we know as the mineral, plant, and animal existence—can serve as a foundation of use in supporting a sensuous, rational, and spiritual *human* life.

In the interpretation of series and use, Egypt followed enjoyment only, and set down the pictures of things it enjoyed or feared. The Semites were forbidden to make any *copy* or *picture* of the material world and its signification as satisfying a sensuous existence. But they were not forbidden to record impressions on life which intercourse with nature produced on the human spirit (soul, or life). They were enjoined to observe the effects of experience in the world, and to compare them with those primeval gifts present in human conscience,—and we remember that in that primeval life consciousness and conscience were one and the same thing. In this consideration every single world-experience was human; and the memory in which it was forever carried about mentally, was human.

And what is *writing* but *an ultimate of memory?*

This should suffice to make clear, that writing from its beginning was purely human, and every element of it purely human. This is not the place to carry out fully this

most important idea by showing the idea both in the form of the Semitic alphabet, and in the as yet totally unappreciated order in the arrangement of the original signs that lies hidden in the source of the alphabet. At this time this assertion must suffice, that a serious investigation will demonstrate all, while it will more fully appreciate the beginnings of such a consideration by Court de Gebelin and Fabre D'Olivet. While recognizing the full value of the *aleph* standing at the beginning of every alphabet, these scholars have restored to it the meaning as representing humanity, anything essentially human; they have appreciated the great meaning behind the picture. But they failed to penetrate the depth of the sign, that it represents the essence of humanity—its spirituality; for it should never be forgotten that the books of the Semites, so far as they were considered holy (as "the Law and the Prophets"), ever refer to man only in his highest or spiritual capacity. The generalizing in Fabre D'Olivet's interpretation of the deeper meaning of the Hebrew letters, is an appreciation of this reality, felt but wrongly assigned to the Egyptian values in the letters.

If this is rightly the expectation from a coming study of the Hebrew language, credit must ever be given to these early French scholars, Gebelin and D'Olivet, who have started a more rational pursuit in the study of this truly magnificent language, the only one in which the progressive steps of human intellectual advancement are preserved and connected with their true basis, the Giver, God, for

God is Spirit,

the Author of life, who is the Source of all communication, who forever first speaks with man before man learns to speak with Him.

Jacob Emanuel Werren.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

THE MOOD OF CONVENTION, 1923

Our annual meetings have come to have a good deal of variety. They serve as a review of the activities of Convention, at least for the year. We may hear of some activities of which we had not known, and we can have information to date about them all. The "advance reports" in print afford some instructive and stimulating reading. There are sessions given to business, somewhat beset by services and conferences. For the most part, business comes out on the floor from some committee, gets acted on, and not infrequently disappears back to a committee "with power." Few delegates, very few, engage in the consideration or transaction of it. By papers and discussions a pretty wide interchange of thought is made possible on our methods of work and on the substance of our message. All the time we are conscious that we are taking part in what at heart is an extended and concentrated piece of church-going, really. We are attending an annual gathering of like believers and of men and women assembled not only to consider and plan for the work and growth and influence of the Church, but to worship together, too. It is a larger meeting of our religious body. Indeed, in the intensified worship of the annual meetings we are borne along to enter in thought and in spirit the company of all who approach the Lord Jesus Christ to-day with a "My Lord and My God."

Social occasions are many, either provided for on the program or incidentally achieved. To all of us Convention is an opportunity to make and renew acquaintances, and to most of us this is no small feature of it. One could name a year or two, now in the distance, when Convention was almost purely

a social occasion. With the ways and means of the organization's existence and activity, occupation has grown with the years. Increasingly, however, Convention is a worshipful occasion. "Convention Sunday" is the chief day, and the prime feature of that the Communion and its attendant rites or sacrament. This has long been so, and of recent years noon-day services and semi-religious conferences have been introduced freely into the program, and the church-going character of Convention further increased. The Church is there as it is not on lesser occasions. The Church, as it is represented in our body in its country-wide membership, *is;* and there comes to us, too, some thought of the great Church in all the world.

Invisible, as we say,—certainly subject to no church census, and embraced in no assignable church body, nor summed up in all of them together,—a company there is which is seeking regeneration, and which is doing something to bring the world a little more closely up to the Divine will. In the highest sense of the term, this company is the Church. In the Lord's view it is the reality answering to that name. Of this Church every Christian body wants to be at least a fruitful planting-ground, and, if it please the Lord, a living branch. Is there anything more natural for us in annual meeting than to live a bit in the thought of this, "the great congregation"? Or more wholesome? Our own part in the world's spiritual life will be the more distinctly seen. Our outlook will get both sweep and modesty. We shall face up and out. A church's visible self tends to hide the greater unseen reality very easily. Any active religious body is close against its own circumstances in the world, day in and day out. It is conscious of its own necessities and drawbacks and opportunities. It has its own desires and problems. It is the stout representative of a way of thought, and of a teaching, and of a mode of work, on which, naturally, it becomes very intent. It needs to lift up its eyes to the great congregation. There all its efforts will be cast up, or they are misdirected; there they will all be centered, or be self-centered. From this great communion no religious body can turn away by the slightest thought without becoming ir-

reverent. Nor can it work for that kingdom of God on earth which commands all religious bodies and their thought and effort, without enjoying a true prosperity.

> And it shall come to pass in that day, I will hear, saith the Lord, I will hear the heavens, and they shall hear the earth;
> And the earth shall hear the corn, and the wine, and the oil; and they shall hear Jezreel.
> And I will sow her unto Me in the earth; and I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy; and I will say to them which were not My people, Thou art My people; and they shall say, Thou art my God.

And if, as ours does, a religious body sees the Lord planting the Church anew in the world in a Second Coming, does it not need all the more to have the whole goal in sight and be working toward it?

It seems to me that the meetings of the Washington Convention held more than the usual thought for the Church at large. Feeling for a mood or spirit that can be said to characterize them, one could make bold to say that this thought for the larger work and goal of the Church was present in Convention almost to the extent of featuring it. Any one knows how he listens to a speaker, and hears what he says, too; but his main impression is of something unsaid,—the speaker's breadth, perhaps, or his aggressiveness. Deep in Convention's tone and action was a feeling—present, surely, in any Convention, but accentuated in this—for the whole work of the kingdom of the Lord on earth. Self-centered utterances were made, and self-centered positions taken. There were indications that some of us think of our church body as an ark on a vast waste of irreligion and no religion. But that was not the spirit of the collective person, the Convention. Against the other feeling that was plain. Thought for the whole cause, to put it so, was persistent. In the opening address of the President of Convention and in his closing prayer, and in sermon and other address, there was recognition of the Lord's wide activity to-day in renewal of men's spiritual life. An appreciative sense was expressed of auspicious trends in Christendom, especially

the tendency to bring the Lord into areas of our life where His spirit has not been felt before, and the tendency to see the spiritual life an actual achievement only in our every-day existence. At one of its largest gatherings Convention listened—it must have been with self-reproach as well as with approval—to one of the country's leading economists and financiers, as he preached what we call "the doctrine of the larger neighbor" with a definite application to conditions, national and international. The liveliness of our mission fields, especially those in the Philippine Islands, put us in mind of that unseen evangelization which precedes and outruns and alone prospers ours. The presence of a representative from the British Conference (where, incidentally, it seems customary to speak of "The Church Universal") and of a representative from South America made us alive to the extent of our own bounds. Can the Holy Supper be itself, and not mean a communion with the Lord and all His followers everywhere? Convention's set theme, "The Glorified Lord and Our Response to Him," was bound to provoke a vision of His wide activity and a sense of the spreading response to Him; but is it not true that this vision and sense quite "made" Convention? It would seem in keeping that, at the first Convention to have any of its utterances broadcasted, we should find our thought led out a little more vibrantly to the whole work of the establishment of the kingdom of the Lord on earth.

It is worth while to see how the thought was involved in, or may yet be involved in, some measures and discussions of Convention or of its auxiliary meetings.

Church Federation of course lives on the thought for the larger Church and for the kingdom of heaven on earth. The question, What should be our own attitude to Church Federation? was brought up in the meetings of the Council of Ministers. A report was offered, unfavorable to any participation by us in Federation movements or work. Not having been considered by all members of the Committee making it, the report was turned back for further consideration and presentation another year. Unfortunately, despite this action by the

Council, the unfavorable attitude to Federation was reported in the newspapers under the headline, "Church of the New Jerusalem to Stand Alone." What our attitude should be, is a question which will bear a good deal of study and discussion, no doubt, for it can be approached from many sides. As we have already involved the subject in the discussion of the universal church and the specific church and other such distinctions, it may be profitable to thresh all those distinctions out again; it is doubtful whether they ever have been threshed out without confusion. But here, or aside from such controversy, we need say little. Isolation is something we do not need to resolve to have. In believing, as we do, that the Lord is come again the second time to renew His Church, we are infinitely more alone than we want to be. We are lonely enough in many great beliefs and convictions besides this. But we are not alone in having the Lord, or in having His kingdom on earth to put forward, or even in being drawn by Him to a deepened and better informed Christian life. What He moves to-day to do, does not lie on the surface of the ecclesiastical life, nor necessarily within the sphere of it either; and it is not all cut up by the organizational lines which religious bodies have drawn across the face of Christendom. "Old" Christianity and "new" are not divided by any organizational line, even to our observation, let alone a more penetrating gaze; and an "old" belief may be made over with the new faith and in the new spirit, or a "new" belief may be held fearfully tenaciously in the grip of an attitude as individualistic and solifidian as the most venerable traditional teaching. The deepened and better informed Christian thought and life to come are pointed to not only by the doctrines of the New Church, but by conditions and needs. They are imperceptibly led to by the Spirit of the Glorified Lord brooding over the souls and efforts of earnest followers. The new order in Christianity, in which the Lord will reign as never before and His standards be extended to all human activities, is a large cause for which more men labor every day. Not all nominal Christians do; but that is only one more reason why all who do might better give each other comfort

and courage, and recognize the community in their aims by hailing each other and joining hands, each to give what he can, and by way of his best insights and convictions. Leave the actual goal out of sight, and have only certain doctrines, though they are the best ever, to set up and gain assent for, and naturally we must go our way alone; but see the goal, and use the teachings to reach it, and we shall not be able to go alone.

The discussion of the *Messenger's* policy, in Convention, and of the paper's sub-title, "A Weekly Journal of the New Christianity," in the Council of Ministers, also had at heart a thought to see the cause as large as it is. Is it not a deepened and better informed Christianity under the Lord in His Second Coming, or "the new Christianity," which the *Messenger* is to speak for? Is it not for this that the Convention, of which it is the organ, stands? The sub-title holds a thought for the larger cause. It pushes into sight—our sight, the sight of readers—the thing we are striving after, and others are striving after, and which is coming to be. The sub-title reflects the belief that the Lord is making His Second Coming indeed, by ways we know and may co-operate in; and doubtless, too, by ways we do not know, concealed in His wisdom, amply provided in His power. It reflects what seems to be unbelievable to some of us,—the belief that the spiritual world, near and influential here, has some power to arouse here the life which it has come itself to have at the hands of the Lord in His Second Coming. Call the effect "permeation," if you will; but are we sceptical about the other world's nearness and effect here? In other words, policy and sub-title of the *Messenger* think to herald the thing that is taking place under the Lord in His Second Coming,—a movement into a better informed and a deepened and far more effective Christian life and thought.

Another project, it is to be hoped, will be considered more fully than it has been in the light of a thought for the best working out of our cause. This is the proposal to issue a "New-Church Version of the Word," as it has been called. We have profound and startling contributions on the Bible to make

to Christian thought, without any question whatever. It is a question how to make them. We want to make known the fact that in certain books of the Bible there is a spiritual sense. The publication of those thirty-six books by themselves would seem to do that signally. The trouble is that such a publication heralds other ideas which we do not mean and do not hold; as, that the Bible outside those books means little or nothing to us, for we omit them from the one edition which we concern ourselves to publish. Further, putting out these books with summaries of their spiritual meaning, and translated to give more accurately the basis of spiritual interpretation, we will also make it seem that the Bible to us is the spiritual sense, and that the sense of the letter, or the Scriptures as we have them, mean as little to us as the whole books we omit from the edition. And yet, "In the sense of the letter the Word is the very Word itself" (Doctrine of the Holy Scripture, n. 39). But—what concerns our present thesis about Convention—it would seem as though we could do the right thing more nearly rightly. Can we not say our say about the deeper meaning in the Word so as to introduce our teaching constructively and co-operatively, and not in an invidious and divisive way? We repeat the Lord's Prayer now differently from Christians generally; we divide and number the Commandments differently from the body of Christian people with whom we have most to do; in an edition of the Word such as has been considered we should cut down, not formally but very substantially, the ground we have in common with the Christian Church of the Lord's first establishing, and with possible co-workers about us. Is our work done by walking apart and standing alone, or by keeping all the common ground we have with others, and giving our best along with them?

The *Messenger* will have reported the Convention meetings in detail before this. We attempt nothing but a general characterization of the meetings. Among inspiriting or pleasing single happenings or features of the meetings of the Convention and its auxiliary bodies, there come to mind, in a measure of chronological order, the brilliant impromptu comments of

the Rev. E. M. L. Gould on the appeal of the Lord and Him Glorified; the sweep and clarity of the paper of the Rev. H. C. Hay on the Incarnation; the inspiration of Mrs. Winthrop Sargent's charming account of her work with adult classes at Philadelphia; the uplifted and clear appeal of the beloved John Goddard on two occasions; the touching presentation of a gift to Mr. James Richard Carter in recognition of his long and solid service as Treasurer of Convention; the grace and strength of the presiding of the President of Convention; the engaging and helpful participation of the Rev. S. J. C. Goldsack in many meetings; the diffident but definite preaching by Mr. Frank A. Vanderlip of the obligations resting on such "larger neighbors" as groups of men and nations; the warm hospitality of the Wilmington and Washington people; the delightful snap and the genialness given the Washington meetings by the Pastor of the National Church, who is rapidly becoming the veteran conductor of Conventions; the spirited and informing character of the Missions meeting on Sunday evening; the heartfelt tribute paid to our self-sacrificing worker in the Philippine Islands, the Rev. G. G. Pulsford.

The Convention-goer can have come home prizing his own church affiliations because they let him into the work of the day uniquely and distinctly, and at the same time bring the whole of that work into sight, and reckon with it, which the Lord, moving to a new Christian day, is seeking to accomplish. It seemed that we were getting along to our objective.

WM. F. WUNSCH.

RELIGION AND MORALITY

THE conditions of modern life and the drift of modern opinion tend to obscure the distinction between religion and morality, and to confuse one with the other.

Think of the immense development of the mechanical conveniences of life: air machines, steam and electric railways, the automobile and other motor vehicles on land and sea. Think

of wireless telegraphy, the telephone and telegraph; and the numberless conveniences for home and farm. Think of the outpourings of the press, free schools, theatres and moving pictures. The effect of all this is to absorb and to externalize men's attention, interests and activities. Ease and comfort are supplied with little or no direct thought and effort. Amusement and recreation are enjoyed at little cost of personal exertion. The family may sit at home around the fireside and listen to plays and concerts, public discussion, sermons and addresses, hundreds of miles away in a far off city. The result is that muscular fibre is weakened by inaction, the mind is enfeebled by the flood of impressions and the ease of acquirement. Men become the victims of sensations and ideas; they lose the habit of digestion, reflection, and sustained thinking, as well as sustained effort. The wide and easy distribution of knowledge is overwhelming, ideas and opinions pass current from one to another without undergoing transformation in the crucibles of thought. In this way the masses become the prey to literary, scientific and political, not to speak of religious, propaganda. Such conditions are unfavorable to the healthy development of morals and religion, and to discriminating appropriation of either.

On the other hand these conditions offer advantages not heretofore available for enriching and elevating human life. Relief from the exacting and exhausting toil of excessive and constant manual labor sets free energies which may be employed in larger mental acquirement and in steadily directed intellectual activity. No doubt, certain groups, however small comparatively, such as artists, students, teachers, investigators, avail themselves of these advantages and constitute a productive force in the social body whereby conservation and progress are assured and achieved. History, science, and philosophy are cultivated with extraordinary facilities, and within these small circles there is more or less steady effort to be independent and original. As a consequence, we find here constructive and productive activity, and intellectual progress; we also find interest and progress in the theory of morals and in the critical

study of religious history and experience, but no corresponding interest and progress in religious faith and conduct.

The obvious reason for the lack of potent and practical interest in religion is the prevalent and dominant naturalism of the day. Naturalistic and rationalistic presuppositions underlie and direct, vaguely but effectively, the course of thought in all the great branches of intellectual interest. The common if not inevitable result is that anti-religious or non-religious moods and attitudes are established. These moods and attitudes are stimulated, developed, and supported by the materialistic and naturalistic doctrine of evolution which starts out and proceeds on the assumption that all the facts and processes of nature are to be interpreted and understood in terms of the properties and the behavior of matter, of material bodies however complex, and however small in the final analysis; and so too human behavior, achievements, and possibilities are to be interpreted in terms of the all-sufficient self, whose original and unaided efforts make history and explain it, and account for all the kinds and degrees of human experience, whether intellectual, moral, or religious. Such philosophies have come down from the time when man ate of the tree of knowledge and became as God knowing good and evil. But these philosophies have been enormously developed and fortified by the extraordinary successes, real and apparent, of modern science; by pulpit, forum, and press they have been instilled into popular thought and so have become constituent of the common sense of civilized mankind, especially of Christendom. In this atmosphere our moral systems have grown up, and moral habits of thought and action have been established. Metaphysical egoism has transformed idealistic morals into the principle of self-expression, and morality has tended to become a chaos of individual self-assertion, however uninformed and unenlightened. The naturalism of Rousseau that the Self is primitively good, and has been distorted and corrupted by the vicious influences of the social environment, has permeated the common thought; so that there is even in religious teaching a distinct cleavage between spontaneous and fundamental thinking

on the one hand and religious professions on the other. The religious mind has thus been naturalized, and individualistic philosophy and morality have come to direct and dominate thought and conduct. Religious profession and religious forms of speech do indeed survive, but the meaning is sought and found in the morals of natural behavior.

The field of morals has been immensely extended and complicated by the growth of social and industrial institutions and activities. The conditions of life have become so different with the increase of population, especially in the exceedingly congested areas of population, from those of pioneer days when the population was small and widely distributed, that the needs and demands of the social body as such have become more and more imperative; the individual has lost much of his isolation and much of his independence as well. New institutions and new modes of life have been called for and put into operation. The social body has for its protection and welfare been forced to assume progressively enlarged functions incident to social complexity and dependence. The social philosophy of the Fathers expressed in the formula "That government is best which governs least" has to be re-interpreted, and applied to the new conditions. It has become increasingly important and necessary to protect the individual against the encroachments of the social body, and to protect the social body against violations of the social body by individuals and combinations of individuals. Under these circumstances, new moral theories, interpretations, and standards are needed, and they grow up spontaneously. The operations of the highly and widely beneficent institution of the business corporation have to be regulated and brought under subjection to the law of social welfare; so too the combinations of capital, and the management of factories, the use of public franchises such as the railroads, trolley lines, and other public utilities. Accordingly, whether right or wrong, we have the "Anti-trust law," "Eight-hour day law," "the child labor law," and so on. The object of such laws is to protect the mass of individuals from exploitation by corporate groups of individuals. The purpose here in view in-

volves the interests of the mass of individuals on the one hand and of the interlocked corporate interests on the other. Not only are the obligations of the moral individual enlarged and complicated, but the corresponding obligations of the social body as a whole have grown in distinctness and importance; so too the obligations of organized groups, whether financial, industrial, or charitable. Private morality is seen to be more and more concerned with the individual's relations to ever enlarging social groups; on the other hand, the moral obligations of such groups to individuals at large have become more and more obvious and binding. Thus private morality has come to have an enlarged social range and atmosphere; for no feeling, thought, or act of the individual can be indifferent to society, since it leaves traces in his attitudes, habits, or conduct; traces which either improve or injure one's relations to others. Our secret sins as well as our open transgressions are hostile forces in the social body, and so far they are destructive of the general welfare.

Mr. Frank A. Vanderlip, in his notable and illuminating speech at the Convention banquet, dwelt impressively on the enlarged moral significance of acts when they pass from the individual to the social status. With some hesitation he ventured to define what he meant by the moral and the immoral. He defined the immoral not in the abstract as that which violates the moral law, but in the concrete as that which is definitely and positively injurious either to the individual or to the social body. He selected certain instances of injurious and immoral conduct, and developed their social enormities. For example, A steals B's pocket-book, and thereby injures B and through him a circle, larger or smaller, of others; the injury is recognized as immoral, and by the law is made a crime. In the single case, the injury extends only to a relatively small group, but the law anticipates and in a measure prevents its repetition. When, however, the government by unjust taxation takes money from the pockets of all its citizens, the injury is immensely multiplied and the immorality and criminality are all the more vicious. The moral law against stealing as an act of

injury to others applies to groups and combinations of individuals and to governments as well as to single individuals, and with even greater force. So with lying and killing. When one man lies to another, the injury is confined to a relatively small circle; but when the candidate for office lies to his constituents, or when organized and powerful groups, whether industrial, economic, or political, operating through the subsidized press, lie to the general public, to the universal social body, the lying is immensely more hurtful, and the immorality correspondingly enormous. When one man kills another, injury is done to others in greater or less degree, but when organized groups of men meet to kill each other, or when the nations of the world organize lying, stealing, and killing, as is done in war, injury is done to mankind, and the immorality exceeds all bounds. The important fact in these cases is that the injury and the immorality grow with the social agency and the social effects of the act. The result is a change of emphasis in the moral judgment of acts, due to measurement in wider and wider social terms. "Private morality" is seen to propagate wider and wider circles of public morality. On the other hand, close inspection reveals the fact that there is strictly speaking no such thing as private morality; for every impulse, feeling, sentiment, thought, opinion, view, judgment, finds expression more or less completely in attitude, tone, speech, and conduct. The feelings, sentiments, opinions which a man cherishes, therefore, are not private matters, they are social in origin and in effect; they affect the lives, the honor, the reputation, and the usefulness of his fellows.

The social importance of morality is intensified by the development and the conditions of modern business. Business, especially in the case of large business enterprises, is organized and proceeds in two interacting and inevitably conflicting hostile groups, the wage earners on the one hand and the wage payers, who are profit seekers, on the other. With the growth of population and with the congestion of population in large industrial centers, the wage earners become increasingly dependent upon the huge wage paying corporations. The accom-

paniments of this congestion and dependence are poverty, disease, discontent, and helpless misery. Under the pressure of these conditions humane sentiments are aroused in the well-to-do classes, social agencies are invoked, philanthropic organizations and institutions are established and set to work. Churches, hospitals, asylums, public work-houses and houses of refuge, private beneficences, are all enlisted to alleviate and relieve the distress and misfortunes of the poor, the helpless, the misguided, and the deficient. Accordingly, we have two sets of institutions which rival each other in the field of social morality, the one producing poverty, wretchedness, and criminality, the other caring for such products.

Under the stress of the conditions above mentioned the conduct of life is more and more involved in the struggle for existence and for gain, and the pressure of the social environment is more and more insistent and relentless. Conduct, therefore, is increasingly socialized; merit, reward, and satisfaction are sought and found not so much in individual performance as in social participation and efficiency. In other words, social morality claims precedence, and moral purpose and effort are directed to social conditions and results as the specific moral task, the task which affords the proper moral reward and satisfaction. Not only this, but so all-inclusive are social activities and such is the importance of social conduct that all human interests tend to concentrate in the problem of bettering social conditions. It will be remembered here that in agreement with this fact the ethics of Plato and Aristotle culminated in a theory of the State. Moreover, it is fundamental in Christianity that the love of the neighbor is the motive force of the whole body of Christian conduct. We also see in the light of our philosophy that the love of the neighbor is the force which organizes mankind into a co-operative brotherhood, and constitutes what Swedenborg calls the Grand Man, which is precisely the complete form of organized mankind. It is, therefore, no mere chance, no mere episode in human history, that moral and social conduct are so nearly identified in our day. It is rather a proper and orderly achievement of

a primitive, constant, and dominant force,—love, in, and of human nature.

We see, then, that the conditions of modern life operate variously and powerfully, as well as constantly, to force upon men of all classes the acceptance of the principle that *in right social conduct lies the whole duty of man,* that man's true nature, his full capacity, is rightly expressed in such conduct. This conviction is variously worded, and the principle is variously formulated. All the various ways of stating the conviction, or the principle, are summed up in the pregnant form, "a man is good when his conduct [meaning his social conduct] is good." This means that whatever his views or opinions, his thoughts or sentiments, if he does good, he is good; so too whatever his private habits, his indulgence of the "small vices." A common and favorite form of the statement is "no matter what a man believes, so he lives right." At this point, we encounter the transition from morality to religion, and here begins the confusion of the two. What a man believes may include his religious belief, and living may mean living in accordance with his religious belief. The formula contemplates a separation, a contrast and opposition, between belief and living, grounded no doubt upon observation of things as they exist, but it betrays a lack of discrimination, and woeful confusion. It is, of course, the fact that people do not live wholly true to all their beliefs; it is also true that people with some, even many, false ideas and beliefs, do in a way live good lives. But this simply means that people are very complex creatures, in which good, bad, and indifferent are inextricably, bafflingly mixed. It may, then, well be that a man will have a few, or even many, false ideas and beliefs together with some and even more that are good and true. Obviously, then, if he lives a good life, it is not because of his false beliefs, nor because he is indifferent to his beliefs, but because he regulates and directs his living by his true beliefs. It may, accordingly, well be that a man has religious ideas and beliefs that are false, and which if acted out would lead to all kinds of hurtful conduct, and immoralities; but as a matter of fact his life, domestic

and social, is exemplary. This does not mean simply that he lives in indifference to his beliefs, still less does it mean that his life is good in spite of his beliefs; it means that in practise he keeps his false beliefs in the background, and that his conduct is ruled by another set of beliefs, which for various reasons he adopts as his real standards and motive forces. To say, then, that a man's belief is a matter of indifference, so long as he lives right, is another way of saying that for conduct there is no difference between true belief and false; or it is to confuse the true and the false, a thing which Swedenborg calls spiritual adultery.

But the formula has an even more pernicious meaning. It more often implies that a man's religion is a matter of indifference, if his practical life, his social conduct, is good. Here there is abhorrent confusion as to the meaning of the word good. The assumption is that a life may be good quite apart from any religious belief or motive. This is the assumption of naturalistic ethics. Moreover, and this is the especially abhorrent aspect of the formula, the idea most commonly intended is that religion consists wholly of good conduct, in other words that good conduct is the whole of religion. In this meaning, it is really a denial of the existence of God; or if the existence of God is granted in the abstract, it means that in practical life His existence is a matter of indifference. This no doubt is the modern mood; belief in God is professed, but in actual, concrete life He is forgotten and neglected, when He is not spurned. Dependence is placed upon "human prudence" not upon Divine Providence. When, therefore, it is said, "No matter what a man believes, so he lives right," we should appreciate that this is an expression of the spirit of the age; and our duty is to analyze its meaning and observe its effects.

The idea is variously expressed. Even Swedenborg's comprehensive statement, *"Quod omnis Religio sit vitae, et quod vita ejus sit facere bonum"* (religion is the religion of one's life, and the life of one's religion is doing good) is pressed into service. This does not mean that doing good is *ipso facto,* and of itself, religion, nor that there is no religion but the mere

fact of doing good; just the contrary, it means that there is no such thing as doing real good apart from religion. For Swedenborg adds significantly and with emphasis *"Quod nemo possit bonum facere, quod bonum est, a se"* (no one can do good which is really good from himself). In explanation he says, a man may do the same thing either from himself or from the Lord. What he does from the Lord is really good, what he does from himself is not really good. He goes on to distinguish civil good, moral good, and spiritual good. A man who does civil and moral good alone, seems to be a good citizen and a moral man, but the man who does spiritual good does everything from the Lord, and so is at once truly civil and moral. In other words, a man may do civil and moral good from various selfish motives, and his motives are all in the end selfish unless what he does is done from the Lord in acknowledgment, dependence, and obedience. When, therefore, Swedenborg says the life of religion is doing good, he means more than civil and moral good, he means by good what is done from the Lord. The whole New-Church philosophy centers in this fact, the fact namely that a man does good, and can do good, only from the Lord. This does not mean simply that in as much as we all live, move, and have our being in and from the Lord, we as a matter of fact and of necessity do everything from the Lord, just as animals and plants live from the Lord, their Creator and Preserver. While this is forever true, and of constant importance, nevertheless that kind of good is what Swedenborg calls "natural" as distinguished from "spiritual," and this is the distinction that concerns us as men and as Christians. For in the case of men this natural good may in the exercise of freedom and rationality be perverted, and is commonly perverted, so that the natural man is of himself wholly evil, evil by choice and by habit. This is another way of saying that the merely natural man lives constantly in the atmosphere of perverted freedom and rationality; he uses both to promote and to accomplish his selfish ends. It is true that under actual conditions the quality of the natural man is more or less modified by religious and Christian influences, so that

apparently unselfish ideas, thoughts, impulses, habits, and forms of speech, abound in ordinary life; but without thought of the Lord these merely serve as means to accomplish more surely the selfish ends really sought, and to attain some form of self-satisfaction. This is why Swedenborg likens the merely natural life to brass, which easily tarnishes.

Religion and morality are distinguishable, and too often are impaired by separation; but neither is complete without the other. Morality without religion is tainted with selfishness, religion without morality is tainted with both selfishness and with ineffectiveness. The essence of religion is acknowledgment and service of God, and God is served through morality and in conduct. In the language of New-Church philosophy, the essence of religion is love, love from God to God, and for men. Such love is abundantly wise, and fully employed in *Use*. Religion and Morality are properly co-operative, and in their co-operation the Divine and the human unite in complete rational freedom.

Lewis F. Hite.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

"FORGIVE US OUR DEBTS"

It is surprising that little attention has been given to the word "debts" in the Lord's Prayer. If we look through the commentaries, we find that attention and interest have been centered upon the meaning of "forgive"; and both the natural and the spiritual meaning of forgiveness have been well set forth. Forgiveness has been properly traced to the Lord's love and mercy; and consequently forgiveness on our part involves and requires the exercise of love and mercy from the Lord. This is most true, and of immense religious importance.

But when we turn to the word "debts," we find the commentaries strangely disappointing and baffling. The first thing that strikes us is that the word "sins" is, without notice or explanation, substituted for "debts"; then we have a most interesting and helpful exposition of the natural and spiritual meaning of the word "sins." Obviously, debts and sins are different things, and if we undertake to identify them by substituting the word "sin" for the word "debt," then we are bound to justify the substitution. If we consult the original, we find that the words *'opheilemata* (debts), *paraptomata* (fall away), *'amartiai* (sins), seem to be used interchangeably; and the confusion remains. We may make the transition from the second to the third through "falling from the right way," "transgression," "trespass"; but from the first to the others there is no bond of connection, the relation is rather that of contrast and opposition. It may seem pertinent to say, as Mr. Giles does (Perfect Prayer, p. 157), that so far as a man fails in obedience, he becomes a debtor to the Lawgiver. But what the man owes to the Lawgiver is obedience, not failure; the Lawgiver

may excuse the failure, but he does not forgive the debt of obedience. Obedience is the first law of life, natural and spiritual; it is an eternal and indispensable obligation. We pay the penalty for disobedience in suffering the punishment which is involved as a consequence of failing to obey. In the courts, it is said that penalty and punishment are due for the violation of the law; but what we owe the law is obedience. When there is failure to obey, the debt is unpaid; nor is it paid by the penalty and punishment incurred by the violation, which is precisely failure to pay. The violation does not in the least affect the obligation to obey; for even in the act of violation, the obligation remains unimpaired. Obedience is what is owed, the debt to be paid, under all conditions. The law implies and requires obedience; it forbids and excludes violation, and aims to prevent the punishment and penalty which inhere in it; the purpose of the law is to secure the blessing of life-giving, not to bring suffering. Obedience and violation are opposites; we owe and perform the act of obedience, we shun and exclude the act of violation; the one is a debt, the other is transgression and sin.

In view of this relation of opposition, we have a serious difficulty before us in attempting to interpret the petition, "Forgive us our debts," and to reconcile the interchange of terms, when we compare the language in *Matthew* with that in *Luke*. Indeed, even in *Matthew* we find the interchange; for when the Lord goes on to interpret and explain the petition, He substitutes "trespass" for "debt." In *Luke,* where the prayer is repeated, He uses the word "sins," but keeps "debtor." Now the question is, On what ground is this interchange and substitution made? In what sense are sins debts, and debts sins? What do we mean when we pray, "Forgive us our debts"? What debts have we in mind? What debts do we owe?

We may attempt the answer from two points of view, the natural or the spiritual.

Speaking naturally, our debts are commonly borrowed money, which we are under obligation to return. The word debt is the English form of the Latin *debitum,* which is derived

ultimately from *de-habere,* meaning to have from. Borrowed money is the money we *have from* some one else; so a debt is what we have from some one else under the promise to return, and the fulfilment of this promise is an obligation.

But we are said to owe many other things. Husband and wife owe each other co-operation, fidelity, trust, confidence, respect, esteem, affection, etc. Parents owe their children support, protection, guidance, instruction, etc.; and children owe their parents obedience, helpfulness, gratitude, trust, etc. As citizens, we owe each other kindness, politeness, fidelity, respect, service; and to the state we owe loyalty, support, protection, co-operation, obedience, and the best exercise of our powers. We owe our bodies proper care and use. We owe our minds education, cultivation, and the exercise of all its faculties at their best. We owe constant and complete conformity to our highest moral standards. We owe the Church and the Lord's kingdom faithfulness, studiousness, industry, and the best service we can render. Above all we owe the Lord for all we are and have, for life and all its activities and blessings; we have all these things *from Him,* and we owe the return of them all in acknowledgment, worship, and service; we owe Him the best use of ourselves and of all our faculties. These are some of the countless debts we owe. Have we these debts in mind when we pray, "Forgive us our debts"? Do we wish to avoid the payment of these debts? Do we want to be excused from paying them? Should we not rather pray for the will, the strength, the knowledge and the wisdom to pay them more faithfully, more constantly, and more completely?

It is true, that when we think of all these countless debts we owe the Lord, and realize how far short we come of paying them, how little effort we make, how often we forget and neglect the obligation to pay them, we begin to quail; we begin to plead the baby act; we exploit our helplessness and our humility; we appeal to the Fountain of Mercy. What do we pray for? Do we ask to be excused from paying the debts; do we give up the purpose and the attempt to pay them? Do we say we cannot and do not wish to pay them? Do we say,

I owe you love, but I cannot pay it? I owe you light, and strength; I have the light and strength from you, but I do not wish to return them; I want to use them for myself. Is this what the prayer means for us? These are the debts we owe. What do we mean by asking, that we be forgiven the payment of them?

Or what is it that we are really asking for? We may indeed at times be overwhelmed with the thought that we owe all that we are and have to the Lord; that we have everything from Him; that we do so little to make a return. It is really and constantly true that we cannot, at any given time or within any given period, make full payment to Him; but do we ever seriously wish to be released from the debts? We do indeed often, or continuously, forget the fact of the debt, and ignore the obligation to pay it. On the other hand, we are constantly reminded that in Him we live, move, and have our being; that His Love is our life; that we receive His Love with all its wisdom, purposes, strength, and activities. We are assured that all He asks of us is, that we receive and live His Love with its purposes undimmed, undiverted, and (that we avoid the utmost evil) unperverted. This is our primitive and all-embracing obligation; this is what we owe at the source, the debt of all debts. We do indeed pay this debt in part by the very fact of living; but in this we pay it more or less blindly, more or less imperfectly. In transgression and sin we renounce the debt, and violate the gift. Full payment involves acknowledgment; it also involves receiving in full measure, and using at our highest and best. We cannot have full measure without making every effort to know and appropriate the qualities and the purposes of the love we receive; we need to know as well as do. The love does not flow into an empty vessel; it flows by way of reaction and reciprocation; it is received in knowledge and choice, in rationality and freedom. This means elevation of spirit, exaltation of faculty, and effort to grasp and to transmit the life of love and wisdom that come in breadth of view, depth of insight, and affection for use. This means education in the highest sense and at the highest level. In this education the

full duty of man is done, and the full joy of life is won. As we lift up our minds and hearts in knowledge, intelligence, and wisdom, in will and in effort, the Lord descends to us and operates through us. It is especially in spiritual, not merely in natural, wisdom that the Lord is making His Second Coming; and we must rise to the level of spiritual wisdom by doctrine and in life to receive Him. The Second Coming is in spiritual wisdom to spiritual wisdom. To receive Him in this way is our highest duty. It is the debt above all that we owe Him.

These then are the debts, from the highest to the lowest, that we owe; and we have seen that the payment of these debts is imperative and indispensable. But we now face the fact that we do not, and cannot in the brief span of earthly life, nor indeed in any finite period, make full payment. In fact, we make little or no effort to pay to the extent of our ability. It is not so much that we fail to grasp the immensity of the task, or that we despair of accomplishing the impossible; but rather that we find promise easier than performance, and fall back on our weakness. This weakness is a real and constant element in the situation, and it is the ground for our appeal for mercy and pardon. But we ask pardon not for performance, but for failure; for failing to pay, not for payment. We do not ask to be released from the debt; we do not ask to be excused from the paying of it. What we ask is, that we be excused for failing to pay it. It is not the debt, but the non-payment that is to be excused. Here is where the confusion begins; and here apparently is where the transition is made from debt to failure, transgression, trespass, and sin. The transition is made according to Mr. Giles's formula, that a man becomes a debtor when he fails in obedience; in other words, the debt is identified with non-payment, on the ground that a debt is what is owed, and not paid. But this is mere confusion. The debt exists until the payment is made. It does not begin at the time of failure to pay. Non-payment does not make the debt. The debt is made when something is received from another under the promise to return; or when the nature of the gift implies return, as in the case of man's creation. A man is a debtor not

because of non-payment, but in the act of borrowing. In other words, the debt and the debtor exist prior to the time of failure or refusal to pay; and non-payment does not create, nor does it affect, the relation of indebtedness. The debt remains a debt after the fact of non-payment is established, as before.

However, failure or refusal to pay puts the debt and the debtor in a new position, and implies either guilt or inability. It is this character of a debt that connects it with transgression and sin. In this character, a debt is not merely what we owe, but what we do not pay, whether with blame or not. If with blame, then it is an offense, a violation of obligation and of the giver's right. This creates a new obligation, namely, that of satisfying the giver's demand for justice; and this the law courts seek to accomplish. In the case of natural, moral, and spiritual laws, to which we owe obedience, the violation, failure to obey, brings its own punishment and penalty. There may be various reasons or excuses for not paying the debt in these cases; but no one thinks of cancelling the obligation, or avoiding the punishment; he incurs the penalty, and pays it.

In the case of our debts to the Lord, non-payment may involve ignorance, inability, or guilt. In the latter case, we have our secret sins and open transgressions; and when we pray, "Forgive us our debts," we may have in mind unintentional and willful transgressions, and deliberate violations. For all these we may properly ask forgiveness, if we are really repentant, if we mean to shun them in the future, and rely upon the Lord's help for the strength to do it. Here we appeal to the Lord's mercy, His love for a fallen creature. Forgiveness in this case means, giving the strength to overcome in temptation; not merely that our sins be forgotten; for they are to be blotted out by repentance and new life.

We may, then, well and properly pray "Forgive us our debts"; but it is of immense moral and spiritual importance that we understand the petition not naturally but spiritually. To "forgive our debts" in the spiritual sense is not to cancel them, but to secure their payment. When the debts are not paid because of weakness or willfulness, then the guilt incurred

calls for repentance and obedience. The petition is really a prayer for help and fulfilment.

LEWIS F. HITE.

DIVINE REVELATIONS.

IN discussing the subject of Divine Revelations it will be my purpose, as far as lies in my power, to show the manner in which revelations were given at various times by the Lord, their character, and the use which is to be made of them by the preacher of the Lord's New Church.

It has always been a question in the Church as to the manner in which revelation was given to mankind. In fact it has often been questioned whether the Infinite can communicate with finite, and also as often denied that He can. Not until it was made known through Swedenborg, has there been a rational explanation of the possibility of Divine revelation being given to mankind, and how it was effected.

One of the first things that the work entitled "The Arcana Cœlestia" does for us, is to lead us to see that the first chapters of Genesis are purely correspondential; by which is meant, that the literal sense is not the true sense, but that within it, as the soul is within the body, there is the "internal-historical sense," which sense is descriptive of the regeneration of the people of the Most Ancient Church.

In the second place it is made clear in the Writings that the Lord always comes to man as the Word. It is also made clear that the Most Ancient people had no written Word, for they had no spoken language. How, then, the uninformed man would ask, could there possibly have been a revelation to people who had no language, when it is claimed the Lord always comes to man as the Word? Here again we find that there is no difficulty, when it is understood that the first chapter of Genesis treats of the regeneration of the spiritual man, while the second chapter describes the state of the regenerated celestial man, which state is one of perception, by means of which gift

from the Lord man is able to interpret intuitively the significance of nature, the Lord's created Word. Consequently, the Lord came to the people of the Most Ancient Church, called "Adam" or Man, as the Word by influx into their minds. Concerning this we are taught in "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 2896:

> The Word in the Most Ancient Church, which was before the flood, was not a written Word, but was revealed to every one who was of that church. For they were celestial men, and were thus in perception of good and truth, as angels are—with whom they also had familiar companionship; thus they had the Word written on their hearts. . . . . All the things which they saw and apprehended by any of the senses, were to them representative and significative of celestial and spiritual things which are in the Lord's kingdom.

It is evident from the manner in which the Most Ancient Church received a Divine revelation, that by the term "Word" is mean much more than what is usually understood by it; for we read as to the revelation given to the people at that time, that it is called the Word. The instruction in "Arcana," n. 2895, is:

> As regards the Word specifically, it had existed in all times, but not the Word which we have at this day There had been another Word in the Most Ancient Church, which was before the flood, and another in the Ancient Church, which was after the flood; then came the Word written by Moses and the prophets in the Jewish Church; and lastly the Word that was written by the Evangelists in the new church. The reason that there was a Word in all time, was because by the Word is communication of heaven with earth, and because the Word treats of good and truth, from which man is to live happy forever; and on this account in the internal sense it treats of the Lord alone, because all good and truth are from Him.

It is therefore well to remember, in the light of the foregoing, that the Word of the Lord, in a fundamental sense, is not a merely external thing; and yet, wonder of wonders, when the Most Ancient people lost their perceptive faculty, and the door of the celestial degree of the mind was closed, the spoken word and language became a necessity, which was provided by the Lord, as we are taught, by leading those called "Enoch" to reduce to writing the perceptions of the Most Ancient

Church. It is in this light that we see the real nature of the first style of the written Word.

Thus we find that the manner in which revelation was given to mankind, was by influx into the minds of celestial men, which resulted in the language of correspondence—the language in which the first eleven chapters of Genesis are written. Those called "Enoch" also formulated doctrinals of faith for the use of the Ancient Church, also called the Noatic; for to "walk with God" is a form of expression that signifies "doctrine concerning faith," and the name "Enoch" means to instruct.

It is well known to all ministers and students of the Writings, that the second style of the Word is characterized as representative. True history begins with Abram; and although mainly historical down to the prophets—for there are, no doubt, many scenes from the spiritual world interwoven with the historical facts—it is all representative of the spiritual things of the Christian Church. This revelation, as we have already been told, was given through Moses. To keep in mind that all the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish Church were representative (the Apostle says, were shadows of good things to come), is very important; for there is constantly a tendency in the Christian world (and the New Church is not free from it) to make use of things of the old covenant which we are distinctly taught have been abolished, in order to bolster up some form of worship and give it Divine sanction. The character of this second style of the Word ought to lead us to emphasize the real nature of this kind of Divine revelation, for representatives are remote correspondences; and in order to receive any spiritual value from such a Word, there is need of lifting the mind from the person, place, and thing to the spiritual and celestial laws, and goods and truths that are portrayed to the senses.

I have lately had some experience of this need in corresponding with a student of the Writings, and also in conversation with two ministers of the Southern Methodist Episcopal Church. The student referred to finds it hard to think that

representative characters like Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and other patriarchs, prophets, priests and kings, could have been unspiritual men; while the Methodist clergymen were of the opinion that the Lord chose the Jewish people to become the custodians of Divine oracles because they were so spiritually fit. The very reverse is true; and this second style of the Word cannot be understood spiritually, unless it is clearly perceived that in the case of a representative character, the individual state of the person chosen to act as representative, is not considered as far as his moral or spiritual qualities are concerned. Thus the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary was invented by the Roman Organization because of an extreme view of the nature of Divine revelation; whereas a true understanding of the Word enables us to see that it was only possible for the Lord to redeem the human race by assuming a human from a Jewish mother,—a human full of the tendencies to evil which had been handed down from many generations,—by which he was enabled to meet the powers of hell on their own plane, conquer and subjugate them. It is only in this light that we can understand how Samson, David, Solomon, and in fact all the patriarchs, priests, kings and prophets in the Old Testament, could have represented the Lord's work of redemption and glorification.

We find, then, that the manner of giving revelations was, first, by influx into the mind, giving man a perception of the significance of created things,—also by dreams and communication with angels; second, by correspondence in written form, the Divine truth being ultimated in correspondential form; and third by representatives appealing to the senses, which were communicated to Moses by visions and voices, and which he and others embodied in ritualistic worship.

The third style of the Word, which is called the prophetical, calls our attention to the fourth manner in which Divine revelation was given. The prophets also were in vision and heard voices, as the following teaching indicates:

I was instructed how the prophets, through whom spirits spoke and acted, were possessed; namely, that the spirits occupied their bodies,

insomuch that scarcely anything was left except that they knew that they existed. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 6212.)

The prophets wrote as the Spirit from the Divine dicated; for the very words which they wrote, were uttered in their ears. With them was the truth which proceeds mediately from the Divine, that is, through heaven, but not the truth which proceeds immediately; for they had not a perception of what each thing signified. (*Ibid.*, n. 7055.)

Thus it ought to be evident that the modern view of those who claim that the prophets were inditing messages out of their own minds for the people to whom they spake, is a fallacy. While it is undoubtedly true the prophets understood some of the things that were written down, after they were dictated to them, if their words had been only messages which they originated, their prophecies would not constitute any part of the Word of the Lord. Furthermore, it should also be borne in mind, that, as we are informed, "the prophets represented the Lord as to the Word, and thence as to the Church; and the Lord was *the* Prophet" (Doctrine of the Lord, n. 15). To the New Church, then, the message of the prophet is a message of the Lord in the form of His Word, and treats essentially of man's regeneration, the Lord's glorification, and the establishment of His Church.

Another style of the Word is called psalmody; and no doubt the words were dictated in the minds of those who were used by the Lord in order to foretell His sufferings, temptations and victory, and the like things of His Church.

In the fulness of time, when all things had been Divinely prepared for the fulfillment of all representative and prophetic Revelation, the Lord came into the World by assuming a human, conceived by the Virgin, in order that He might become the Divine Truth in ultimates. Thus again was verified the truth of the statement that the Lord always comes to man as the Word; for the language of St. John's Gospel is familiar: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God . . . and the Word was made flesh." Today we see the great importance of appreciating the true nature of the Divine incarnation by Virgin Birth, thus by

Divine conception, as the Gospels so distinctly teach. For unless the Lord had been Divine as to His soul—thus unless the Divine Itself had been His Father, the redemption of mankind would have been impossible, and the fulfillment of the correspondential, representative, and historical Word would have been impossible, because no merely human being—no one born of an earthly father—could have subjugated the powers of evil, reduced things to order in the spiritual world, and by combats and victories become the Redeemer of the world. But now that the Lord, Who was Jehovah, by His redemptive work has become the Divine Truth in ultimates, we can come in contact with His Omnipotent Power, when we make the right appropriation of His Word, whether it be in the Old or in the New Testament Scriptures; for when we touch it with affection to love and live its truths, we touch Him, and virtue proceeds from Him to heal our infirmities.

Coming now to think of the Gospels, we learn that they are really a part now of the historical Word. Of late I have meditated somewhat upon the problems as to how they were written and when. They were evidently not written at the time when the Lord spake the words. I have no doubt, however, but that the reason why the Apostles were able to write what is contained in each of the Gospels was, that the Lord gave them of the fulness of His Holy Spirit, according to His promise, which was as follows:

> These things have I spoken unto you, being present with you. But the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, Whom the Father will send in My name, He shall teach you all things, *and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.*

In the light of such a promise by Him Who is Wisdom Itself, and who gained all power in heaven and on earth, there is no difficulty in understanding that we have the Lord's Word, or the Divine Truth in ultimate form in the four Gospels.

Nor is the man of the New Church disturbed by the apparent discrepancies in the Gospels; for he is enabled now to see that each Gospel is adapted to the needs of four essentially different points of view, like the four quarters of the spiritual

world; and instead of the apparent discrepancies disturbing his faith, the differences prove to him the wisdom of love in meeting the diverse needs of those who are dominated by the natural will, the spiritual will, the natural understanding, and the spiritual understanding.

In treating of the character of prophetic sayings, nothing was said of "The Apocalypse"; yet the character of this book is quite evidently prophetic. That it treats of the last times of the Christian Church, the final judgment in the world of spirits, the subjugation of the evil, and the formation of a new heaven, and the establishment of the New Church on earth, we may now know; and consequently that it "does not treat at all of worldly but of heavenly things" in the spiritual sense, as we are taught. That no one but the Lord can explain the significance of the book, is distinctly asserted, and ought also to be evident to all who know something of the true nature of the Divine Word. We have then in "The Apocalypse Revealed" the explanation of the book of Revelation; and to go to other sources for an interpretation of this work, is like forsaking a reservoir full of water, and searching for water in cisterns that contain no water!

I come now to the last questions which I wish to raise. You must already have had an inkling that I was leading up to them; viz., what was the way in which Swedenborg, as servant of the Lord, received the revelation contained in his theological works; what is their character; and what is their use. In the first place, Swedenborg was not in a state like the prophets to whom the Word was dictated; consequently it is not correct, strictly speaking, to call him a prophet. While it is, indeed, true that Swedenborg was in a state in which his spiritual senses were opened and in which he had visions, yet we are distinctly told by him that he was at the same time in a condition of full wakefulness, thus in a wholly rational state of mind. The very fact that Swedenborg was fully prepared in the natural sciences before the Lord called him to become the revelator of His Second Coming, shows that he was to enter with his understanding into the truths of the

Word, as he also distinctly affirms. How, then, did he receive the revelation which he characterizes as that which exceeds all revelations ever before given to mankind? We are assured that his spiritual senses were opened by the Lord for his task. We know that he was illumined by the Lord; for without special illumination no one could have expounded the Sacred Scriptures as he has done. In fact he affirms: "For the sake of the end that the Lord might be constantly present, He has disclosed to me the spiritual sense of His Word, in which Divine truth is in its light, and in this light He is continually present." Furthermore, when we consider that he was gifted with a special or peculiar kind of inspiration, and that he was called by the Lord to be His instrument in revealing the genuine doctrines of His Word, its spiritual sense, and the life and laws of the spiritual world to mankind, the question of the character of his writings becomes a very important one, especially to a minister of the Church that is founded upon the Sacred Scriptures as unfolded in his theological writings. And what a wonderful opening of the Word, and a revelation of the spiritual world and the constitution of man we have! Truly, he performed his task well. The revelation testifies for itself.

It has been held by some ministers in the New Church that, when Swedenborg said, "This is the internal or spiritual sense of the Word," it was given to him to see the truth by dictation to his rational mind; but when he began to illustrate the spiritual sense, he had to make use of such facts as he had acquired by his scientific studies. However this may be, it does not appeal to me as satisfactory. It is no doubt true that scientific facts were not dictated to his mind; but it does not necessarily follow that his scientific statements are untrue because he acquired them before his call to office. On the other hand, it seems more likely that the very reason why he was chosen as the Lord's instrument in His Second Coming was, that he had the knowledge concerning nature needed in order to embody a Divine revelation, which was and is so necessary for the salvation of mankind.

The Lord comes to us in His Second Advent as the Word;

for He comes to us as the "Son of Man," and we can now see that by the "Son of Man" is meant the Lord as the Word. Therefore we are taught by Him, in speaking of His coming: "And they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory," by which is meant, as we are instructed: "The Second Coming of the Lord is not in person, but is in the Word, which is from Him and which is Himself." Again, as to the significance of the "clouds" in which He comes and the "great glory and power," we are told that "clouds" signify the sense of the letter of the Word, and that "coming in the clouds of heaven with power and glory signifies that at the end of the Church *He will appear in the Word, and reveal its spiritual sense.*"

In the light of the foregoing it should be evident that the revelation given through Swedenborg is the means of understanding the Word; that while he was Divinely chosen and used to give the world a revelation of the wonderful truths contained in the Sacred Scriptures, it does not seem to me correct, strictly speaking, to characterize his Writings by the term "Word," for we are distinctly taught in "The True Christian Religion," n. 214: "The celestial and spiritual senses without the natural senses are not the Word, for they are like spirit and life without a body; and they are like a palace without a foundation."

But I have no desire by such a statement to undervalue in the least the Divineness of the revelation given through Swedenborg. The doctrines he sets forth from the Word, the spiritual sense made known by him in his works, I do not believe are his opinions. I believe in magnifying them and not in minifying them. I believe we ought to go to them, when we wish to understand the Word and prepare a sermon. If we do, we shall not get into the quagmires of self-intelligence; for we read of the New Jerusalem: "The city hath no need of the sun, neither of the the moon to shine in it," which signifies "that the men of that Church will not be in selflove and in their own intelligence, and in natural light alone"; "for the glory of God did lighten it and the lamp thereof is the Lamb," which

means "they will be in spiritual light from the Divine truths of the Word from the Lord alone."

Although I so highly appreciate the theological writings of Swedenborg as to speak of them as a Divine revelation, I cannot see that it is proper to call them "the Word of the Lord" for an additional reason; namely, that in order to constitute the Word, in the sense in which Swedenborg himself uses the term, it must be in correspondential form, for all revelation from the Lord to man is of this nature, since this is the only way that the Infinite can communicate with the finite, the only way that spiritual and heavenly truth can make itself known. Strictly speaking, the term revelation is not properly applicable to the theological writings of Swedenborg; but as terms by usage come to have various and inclusive meanings, so in the sense of making known what has not been previously known, the term revelation is applicable.

Swedenborg was to be the great revelator of the Lord in His Second Coming, thus the instrument through whom, after Divine illumination and intromission into the spiritual world, Divine, heavenly and spiritual things have been made known, so that man can enter with the understanding into the truths of faith. His theological works are a disclosure of truth to the rational mind, and carry with them their own authority. In trying to liken them to what their function is in the establishment of the Lord's New Church, I would say they are scales and yardsticks by means of which we can weigh and measure all things pertaining to the doctrines and life of religion; they are like a telescope that brings distant things near, and makes them of practical value; they are like the microscope, enabling us to see what we could not see before; they are like principles and rules in mathematics, which enable us to solve problems that cannot be solved without them. They are all this and much more, because they are the truth opened from the Word to the rational mind; they are not the Word, however, but the means of understanding the Word. They are, in my judgment, just what Swedenborg himself said they are, "the Universal Theology of the New Church signified by the New Jerusalem,"

which means the true doctrines of the Word of the Lord; they are the Heavenly Secrets of the Word of the Old and New Testaments, which he characterizes as its spiritual sense; they are a disclosure of the constitution of the spiritual world and the nature of man as to his spiritual structure; they are a philosophy of the nature of the Divine Life of Love and Wisdom, the origin of evil, thus an exposition of the laws of cause and effect; they are a disclosure of the laws of Divine Providence, which is the government of the Divine Love and Wisdom of the Lord; they are the Heavenly Doctrines of the New Jerusalem; they contain the laws of true marriage love and its opposites; they are indeed *revelation* to the spiritual rational man. They are these things, as Swedenborg himself claimed; and one can prove by reading and study that they are what he claims them to be. By means of them the Lord effects His Second Coming; for, as we are taught, "The Second Coming of the Lord is not in person, but is in the Word, which is from Him and is Himself."

Louis George Landenberger.

CURRENT LITERATURE

"HE OPENED TO US THE SCRIPTURES" *

The New-Churchman may infer from the title of Professor Bacon's recent book—namely, "He Opened to Us the Scriptures"—that it is one of especial interest for him. It is; though the interest assumes an unexpected form.

Regularly we take these Gospel words to refer to the opening of the Scriptures in their spiritual sense. In fact, we argue from them to the existence of a deeper meaning in Scripture. What else could have been opened to Cleopas and his fellow-pedestrian but such a deeper meaning in the Word? And we use them of expounding such a sense.

But the New Testament as it stands was an opening of the Old Testament Scriptures. Yet it is not the "spiritual sense," of course, of the Old Testament. The Lord opened the Jewish Scriptures by giving fresh and fuller expression to the sense they bore. He summed them up in their true intent and proportioned teaching; He put up the standards to which they really led; He took them along to new applications. He fulfilled law and prophets. He did this in so many words in the Sermon on the Mount, but implicitly everywhere. Neither there nor anywhere else, however, did He expound any deeper sense such as the spiritual sense is. All He said is our "sense of the letter" of the New Testament. He freed the essential truth of the Old Testament from the traditions and trivialities

* *He Opened to Us the Scriptures:* A Study of Christ's Better Way in the Use of Scripture. By Benjamin W. Bacon, D.D., Litt.D. (Oxon). New York: Macmillan Company. 1923. 116 pp., 12mo. Cloth, $1.00.

with which the scribes had made a closed book of it, and called men to a righteousness exceeding that of the scribes and Pharisees. It is this way of opening the Scriptures which Dr. Bacon writes of in his "study of Christ's better way in the use of Scripture." The Theological Works speak of this same opening of the Old Testament Scripture for the Christian mind, in "The Apocalypse Explained," n. 948:

> At the end of the (Jewish) Church, which was when the Lord came into the world, the Word was interiorly opened. Interior Divine truths were revealed by the Lord, which were to serve the new Church to be established by Him, and did so serve it.

Professor Bacon's thesis then is, that in the Lord's use of the Scriptures we have pointed out our most rewarding address to them. If we are to emulate Him in any degree, or Paul either, we shall consider that the Scriptures convey a truth which can be opened out, more and more, from what is written. They were the product of a movement of truth in the Jewish mind and life which went on over centuries. In turn they are the means to a movement of truth on the Christian mind. The Lord penetrated to this advancing "spiritual content," to the "moral and religious values," and to the "permanent" in the Old Testament Scriptures, and set that out, "using the Scripture with extraordinary disregard of the letter and equally remarkable penetration to the spirit." A further truth and deeper in both Testaments will reward and does reward the Christian's pursuit of "Christ's better way." I do not know that we reckon properly with this possibility and fact. For this growth of the truth on the Christian mind, short of a disclosure of any distinctly "spiritual sense" in the Word, is solid enough, and deep, and to the spiritual needs of the day. It is more directly argued to, than is a disclosure of the spiritual sense, from the opening of the Old Testament in the New. What is more, it is no mere possibility; it is in process, as any one knows who has followed modern study and use of the Scriptures, especially of Prophets and Gospels, in application to contemporary moral and religious problems and needs.

But with the words of Scripture turning spirit and life in

this way, does it become harder really or easier to get an ear for the proposition that in the Word there is a still deeper meaning to be disclosed to the Christian mind now, as the passage quoted above from "The Apocalypse Explained" goes on to say? Aside from some other considerations, we ought to be able to present the idea of a deeper meaning more readily, in view of the recognition that there is a movement of truth in the Scriptures from that first delivered to what more God has to speak. The disclosure of a spiritual sense, beyond the fullest sense of the letter, should seem the more natural in that view. The most intelligent use of Scripture fights shy of the thought of any other meaning than the one that can be plainly established in Scripture with all the aids of study; but some gain there is in the growing recognition that revelation has been progressive, and that the Scriptures are the vehicle as much as the outcome of a movement of truth. On another question, whether it is as urgent as it was in the days of a deadening literalism, to present the thought of a deeper meaning and the deeper meaning itself, I think we can feel encouraged, too. As the spirit and life in the letter of the Word are reached to by the Christian mind, it does seem as though the urgency which exists with deadening literalism to put forward the deeper meaning of Scripture is lessened; but is not the current then with the exposition of a spiritual meaning? Not only is it the spirit and life in the letter that are sought, but when they are, it cannot but be that the spiritual sense is approximated more and more. Although men may be conscious of penetrating only into the one meaning of Scripture, the outcome is bound to be an arrival at some of the substance, and the more pertinent substance, of the spiritual sense. This sense is open in many places to the earnest reader. "Here the sense of the letter is similar to the internal sense, as here and there elsewhere, especially where the essentials of faith are treated of, which, because they are necessary to salvation, are stated in the letter as they are in the internal sense," says Swedenborg in "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 2225. The deeper meaning of the Word is the upshot, too, of a right use of the Scriptures in following up

their teaching. "The internal sense is not only that sense which lies concealed in the external sense, but is that also which results from a number of passages of the sense of the letter rightly collated, and which is perceived by those who are enlightened by the Lord in their understanding," says Swedenborg elsewhere (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 7233 [3]). We are reminded of a comment of the Rev. John Worcester's, written over twenty years ago:

> No doubt it will be a long time before there is a recognition of a spiritual sense within the letter of the Word; but it is much that there is a recognition of the Divine Spirit illuminating the letter, and giving there the guidance to the sentiments and aspirations of men which is indispensable to spiritual life and progress. This position I think is firmly established, and can be trusted as the basis for future development of the true understanding of the Scriptures. (The Bread of Life, p. 98.)

Unquestionably there is a broad highway of moral and religious earnestness and insight leading to some grasp of the deeper meaning of Scripture in the letter, in addition to the specific and technical approach by way of a detailed knowledge of correspondence. Will not the Lord lead men by both ways—really, must He not, by His express tuition and under the tutelage of the Spirit of truth?

The exposition of a spiritual sense in Scripture seems to be laid under the ban by the deserved condemnation of allegorical interpretation. This mode of interpretation modern studies render impossible. But we make a mistake to array spiritual interpretation with allegorical. The most that the two have in common is the very broad notion that there is another sense to Scripture besides the sense of the letter, or the historical meaning. As modes of exposition they are utterly unlike. The spiritual sense, in the first place, is as definite a content of Scripture as the sense of the letter is in modern study. The exposition of the deeper sense becomes as exact and painstaking a procedure as grammatical and historical interpretation is. It is as free from subjectivity. We need to cast aside the thought of any resemblance between allegorical interpretation and ex-

position of the Word's spiritual sense. Granting the definiteness of the meaning of the Scriptures for historical and grammatical exegesis, we can speak forcefully of the further definite range of truth in the Word, as little subject to vagary and subjective interpretation in good hands as the other, and yielding to, and capable of being tested by, methods of proceeding which are valid for all students.

Professor Bacon makes some allusion to what is going on in the Christian world in its attitude to the Bible. He may startle some persons; but he intimates a parallel between the way the "Fundamentalists" take the Bible to-day, and the way those took it who crucified the Lord. The former are for the thing written, as written. So were the scribes, and Pharisees, and elders. That was their hard, and ungiving, and unliving authority, with which they taught. To the Lord the authority was the truth written, which could and did go on to express itself further. With that living authority *He* taught. But no more than "Fundamentalists" now did the scribes recognize any "movement of truth."

> Nothing is more certain about the career of Jesus than that He perished a martyr to a more living, free and progressive interpretation of the Scriptures, a victim to the conservatives of Temple and Synagogue, both of whom built on the inspired authority of Moses, though bitterly at odds among themselves. (P. 69.)

> Jesus fell a victim to fanatical devotion to the law and the prophets in their literal application rather than their spiritual elements. For it was Jesus' uncompromising insistence upon their spiritual content which provoked opposition. (P. 40.)

We recall how we are told that the Lord in being crucified was only being treated as the Word was. Have we ever thought to be as specific as this, however?

> The main issue on which Christianity parted company with Judaism was the use of Scripture. Jesus came into conflict with the religion of the synagogue because under the leadership of scribe and Pharisee it was already becoming a religion of the book as it afterwards became. It knew a God of yesterday. He had given the commandments amid the thunders of Sinai. It knew a God of to-morrow. He was to intervene for judgment with the trump of the archangel at the last day.

But the God of to-day, of nature, of history, of the growing human spirit, it did not know. Jesus revealed this unknown God. He was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and also "of all the children of God that are scattered abroad." He was the living God. (P. 97.)

To-day the question of the use of Scripture is supreme, and the fact is beginning to be recognized. It is a "fundamental" whether we look on divine revelation as static or dynamic. It is a question of a living or a dying church whether it shall lay hold upon letter or spirit, whether it shall bind itself to the dead past or to the living present and the expanding future. It is "fundamental" whether we have a Christian or un-Christian doctrine of Sacred Scripture. (Pp. 113, 114.)

And, truly, it may be no contribution on the questions just asked to cry, "Well, here, in the Scriptures, and pointed to in the Theological Works of Swedenborg, one has the deeper spiritual content of the Word to which we need to move on." For, not only are men moving towards the truth of the Scripture by other less conscious and less open ways, finding a spirit and a life they never did before in what is often called the "dead letter," but it is perfectly possible for men, having taken the Scriptures as a fixed deposit of truth, now to take the revelation made in the Theological Works in the same way, and make a dead letter of them. The coming debate in Christendom to many other observers besides Dr. Bacon will turn on the Scriptures. If so, the "new"—that is, the really "new"—will break away from the "old" in whatever religious body, on the issue again on which Christianity broke with Judaism. The Lord will have fared again as He did then, and come each time as the Word and in it.

Of many subjects related to the main thesis there is stimulating and fresh discussion in the five chapters of the book. Theories—pagan, Jewish, early Christian, mediæval, and later—of Scripture inspiration are trenchantly reviewed. The canonization of the books of Old and New Testament is traced in some rather novel light.

The successive chapters of the book are entitled: I. Primitive Ideas of Divine Revelation; II. How Christian Writers Conceive of Their Own Inspiration; III. Private Interpreta-

tion, and Interpretation Approvable by All; IV. The Example of Jesus and Paul; V. The Witness of the Spirit.

Wm. F. Wunsch.

MEDIÆVAL CIVILIZATION.

The Vanuxem Foundation Lectures for 1920 at Princeton University have at length found permanent form in "Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages,"* issued in admirable form by the Princeton University Press. Its author, Maurice de Wolf, Professor of Mediæval Philosophy in the Universities of Louvain and Harvard, is here supplementing his recent (1922) "Mediæval Philosophy Illustrated from the System of S. Thomas Aquinas" with an introduction to that great civilization, culminated in the thirteenth century, which gave rise to Dante and Aquinas. In the writer's words:

> The purpose of the study . . . is to approach the middle ages from a new point of view, by showing how the thought of the period, metaphysics included, is intimately connected with the whole round of Western civilization to which it belongs. . . . [Philosophy is to a large extent the product of] influences issuing from the spirit of the age, in its economic, political, social, moral, religious and artistic aspects; it also exerts its own influence in turn upon the general culture with which it is organically connected.

According to Professor Beers of Yale, in his remarkable "History of Romanticism in the 18th Century," that great movement which so overspread the 19th century was a return to mediævalism. Whether that be a full and complete enough definition of so portentous and far-reaching an influence, it is certainly true that the romantics early began to find beauty in Gothic ruins and dim cloisters and ballads, that the Middle Ages became one of those Arcadias in the creation of which romanticism was so fertile. This neo-mediævalism has never

---

**Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages.* By Maurice De Wolf. 323 pp., 8 vo. Princeton University Press. 1922. Cloth, $3 net.

died out—this enthusiasm for a rich and unified civilization which reached its consummation. In the 19th century, it found expression not only in poetry and art (Pre-Raphaelitism) but in religion, in the Oxford Movement with its renaissance of Catholicism in the Church of England. In our century it takes various forms and is diverted into various channels. A comparatively recent book acclaims "The Thirteenth, Greatest of the Centuries." Henry Adams, in his "Mont St. Michel and Chartres," is the captivated Puritan. Ralph Adams Cram, at once as Catholic and as artist, apprehends in Gothic the supreme achievement of an art which worked at the prompting of religion. Archibald Davison of Harvard returns to find the most genuine ecclesiastical music in Gregorian. And so it goes.

Professor De Wolf is careful to assure us that he is not one of these enthusiasts who would welcome a return to mediævalism. He says:

> It is positively distressing to see historians, under the spell of special sympathies, proclaim the thirteenth century the best of all centuries of human history, and prefer its institutions to our own. Such *laudatores temporis acti* really injure the cause they attempt to serve. . . . To go back to the middle ages is out of the question; retrogression is impossible.

Not a mediævalist in this sense, Professor De Wolf is genuinely appreciative of his period. Indeed, had he not so openly refused the honor, one might almost have suspected him of being one of those vicious *laudatores* against whom he protests. At any rate, his words of wisdom on the method we should employ in attempting to come into rapport with the mediæval civilization (or indeed with that of any past period) are admirable. We should, he says, "avoid forcing parallels with the mentality and customs of our own age," should attempt to think after the mediævals' way of thinking, to judge the civilization of the thirteenth century on its own merits, by referring it to the humanist's "fixed norm: *the dignity and worth of human nature.*"

> By this standard a civilization stands high when it achieves its own intense and coordinated expression of the essential aspirations of

the individual and the collective life; . . . when it rests . . . on a rational organization of the family, the state, and other groups; when it allows, further, for full development in philosophy, science, and art; and when its morality and its religion foster their ideals on a basis of noble sentiment and refined emotions. In this sense the civilization of the thirteenth century must be counted among those that have succeeded in attaining to a high degree of perfection.

The first chapters of the book deal with the early flowering of the Middle Ages in the 12th century, with its feudalism, its delimitation of the sciences, and its "anti-realistic [Aristotelian] solutions of the problem of universals." Chapter four discusses the rise of the great universities, particularly that at Paris; section six usefully maps out the prevailing classification of knowledge (this is particularly full and complete). Chapters five and six deal with four important tendencies or trends of scholastic philosophy: its unity; its cosmopolitanism or universality; its optimism; and its impersonality. In chapter seven, Professor De Wolf deals vigorously with the relation between scholasticism and the Church, protesting with much vehemence and irritation, it would seem, against that universal "snap judgment" which is forever repeating that this important philosophical system is "philosophy in the service, and under the sway and direction of Catholic theology." In reality, save by a few fanatics, philosophy "had been universally recognized since the middle of the twelfth century" as a "science distinct from theology," its independence resting on the "difference in the point of view (*ratio formalis objecti*) from which philosophy and theology regard the material with which they are occupied (*materia*)."

The heart of the book, chapters eight and nine, attempt a summary and over-simplified presentation of scholastic philosophy. Its two most salient features are declared to be intellectualism ("a doctrine which places all the nobility, all the intensity, the whole value of psychical life in the act of knowing"), and pluralism. The New Church emphasizes Love as the life of man (as Rev. Professor Hite has so often said, *Love is God*). The Middle Ages conceived of life in terms of thought: man is a *thinking* creature; he possesses the power of abstracting

(*abstrahit*) ideas from sensible contents; "abstraction is the royal privilege of man." Under A Pluralistic Conception of the World, the writer concentrates on the scholastic doctrine that *the individual alone exists* (Aristotelianism, as opposed to the Platonic doctrine that *ideas* alone really exist: the *idea* of a horse is the reality from which actual individual horses derive). Much indeed of the book is devoted to an emphasis of mediæval individualism (this is necessary because so many poorly informed writers have attempted to prove that mediævalism is crushed individuality). The Church and the empire exist for the individual, not *vice versa*.

There is also, in chapter nine, a definition of various of the principal terms of scholastic philosophy which the layman ought to find useful; such words as "substance," "accident," "act," "potency," "matter," and "form." (S. Thomas Aquinas is almost always the authority for such "definitions.") The Dante student, and the student of Swedenborg's philosophy, who remembers that his master used "scholastic Latin," will find them helpful.

In the concluding four chapters, scholastic philosophy is traced in its imprint upon social life, its theory of the state, its conception of human progress. The almost exclusive dominance of scholasticism through the period under study is illustrated by the un-mediæval character of the only two opposing philosophies which made any head at all—Neo-Platonism and Averroism.

There are defects in this volume. Professor De Wolf is somewhat lacking in sense of proportion; there are light touchings of subjects which call for fuller explanation, and there is much re-iteration of what is obvious and readily comprehensible. There is a tendency to simplicity, beyond proper and helpful bounds (a writer of introductory manuals is always subject to the temptation to sharpen and accentuate mountain peaks for the inexperienced). The sketch of the scholastic philosophy itself is curiously sandwiched in between sections on the civilization from which it arose and which it influenced, although the layman (for whose purposes the book was, it

would seem, written) would prefer to have it digested first. In a word, the organization of the book is defective. But the style is often attractive; Professor De Wolf writes *con amore* as well as *cum scientia;* he opens "magic casements" through which many might well look for the first time upon one of the greatest of vanished civilizations.

EDWARD AUSTIN WARREN, JR.

ANOTHER SPIRITISTIC ATTACK ON THE BIBLE*

"Ancient Lights" was written to explain the psychical phenomena of the Bible from the point of view of spiritism. The general teaching of the book is, that the seers and prophets of the Old Testament were mediums of greater or less power, and that our Lord and His apostles were also mediums. The author quotes many instances of psychical phenomena mentioned in the Bible; she reviews them all in detail, and explains them according to the theories of spiritism, as being manifestations of psychic powers through mediums.

According to Mrs. Stobart, the appearance of angels to the patriarchs and others in the Old Testament, and to the shepherds and others in the New, were materializations, by which spirits, clothing themselves with ectoplasm from the bodies of mediums, made themselves visible in the world in a material form. When our Lord took Peter, James, and John on a high mountain, and was transfigured before them, it was a case of materialization. She says of this:

> Jesus, therefore, arranged for a psychic séance which should be on a sublime scale. . . . He took Peter, James, and John, presumably the three most powerful mediums. . . . The whole episode is strictly in accordance with the probability that Christ may have dematerialized His earthly body, and have appeared in the shining glory of His

---

* *Ancient Lights;* or the Bible, the Church, and Psychic Science. By MRS. ST. CLAIR STOBART, with an Introduction and a Preface by Sir Oliver Lodge. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1923. 367 pp., 12mo. $3.50.

spirit-form; or He may have reflected the radiance emanating from the spirits of Moses and Elias, who themselves were probably materialized through the mediumship of the three disciples. (Pp. 267-268.)

The theory of materialization in explanation of angels and visions runs throughout the book. This theory seems to be very generally adopted by spiritists at the present day. It totally blinds them to the real truth,—that the visions of the prophets and of John, and the appearances of angels, were seen by the spiritual eyes of the seers.

The author's devotion to spiritism and mediumship causes her to believe that even Jehovah God was only a spirit, who was invoked by these mediums. She says:

The Lord, that is a spirit, spoke unto Abram. (P. 38.)

The Lord, that is, the spirit, presumably the same spirit, appeared unto Abram. (P. 39.)

The Lord, or a spirit from another plane, had manifested. (Pp. 41, 42.)

In explanation of her own use of the term "Lord," she says:

It must, however, throughout this book be remembered that, when these appellations are employed in conformity with the Bible text, they will not necessarily refer to the Being known to us to-day as God, or the Lord God, and most certainly they will not refer to Christ, who, because He is known to us as the Lord, is assumed by the ignorant to be the same Lord referred to throughout the Old Testament. We shall assume that these appellations are in the Bible generally synonymous with angel, or in modern language, spirit. There are, presumably, spirits of all degrees of virtue and of vice on the other plane, as there are men of all degrees of virtue and of vice on the earth; and the communicating spirits of the Old Testament, though referred to as "The Lord," as "God," and as the "Lord God," were of varying degree in spiritual evolution. (P. 36.)

This reduces the Bible and the revelation in it to mere spirit communication, similar in kind and degree to the spirit messages of the modern séances. Having reduced Jehovah to a mere communicating spirit, the Lord and His apostles to good mediums, and the Bible revelation to spiritistic messages, Mrs. Stobart declares that modern spiritism is justified by these ancient practices.

She admits that there are evil spirits of a low order in the spiritual world, and that these sometimes communicate through mediums. But she claims that there are good spirits who communicate, as well as evil ones. She places the prophets, seers, and apostles with the good mediums of modern times. She does not see that there is a wide difference between the prophetic writers and mediums.

The Scriptures make a clear and distinct line between the prophets and mediums and their messages. Jehovah God Himself gave the messages to Moses and the prophets, revealing the laws of life, the laws of worship, the Ten Commandments, etc., in order that the Israelitish Church might be established, inaugurating the worship of Jehovah in place of the idolatrous worship of the degenerate Ancient Church. All the nations in the land of Canaan and surrounding it were idolaters and spiritists. They cultivated in their worship all the demoniac arts which are denounced in the Bible where it says:

> When thou art come into the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations. There shall not be found with thee any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, one that useth divination, one that practiseth augury, or an enchanter, or a sorcerer, or a charmer, or a consulter with a familiar spirit, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For whosoever doeth these things is an abomination unto Jehovah: and because of these abominations Jehovah thy God doth drive them out from before thee. Thou shalt be perfect with Jehovah thy god. For these nations, that thou shalt dispossess, hearken unto them that practice augury, and unto diviners; but as for thee, Jehovah thy God hath not suffered thee so to do. (Deut. xviii, 9-14.)

This law against spiritism is repeated frequently. Mediumship was closely linked with idolatry. The nations which the Israelites dispossessed not only were idolaters and practicers of evil psychic arts, but in connection with these, they practiced the most debasing and sensual evils, and even sacrificed their sons and their daughters to their gods. This is the reason why they were exterminated. Spiritism brought the Ancient Church into utter ruin; therefore it was displaced by the Jewish Church. Even the members of the latter church were given into captivity

because they lapsed into idolatry, spiritism, and the accompanying sensualism.

When our Lord came into the world, spiritism had brought the heathen religions to the lowest depths. Many were obsessed by evil spirits. Our Lord and His apostles cast out the evil spirits, the devils, and the demons which obsessed many. They set free those who had become bound through the practice of spiritism. The great distinction between the apostles of the Lord and the mediums of the degenerate religions of their age was, that Christ and the apostles acted and taught from their rational mind and thought, in freedom according to reason; but the priests and ministers of the degenerate religions were mediums, subject to all the malign and evil influences coming from evil spirits. Spiritism is not an untried system. It was in use for thousands of years before Christ. It brought the human race to the brink of spiritual destruction. Nothing but the coming of Jehovah God into the world by clothing Himself with our nature, could avail in stemming the tide of evil. He effected a judgment in the spiritual world. He cast out of the world of spirits the evil crew that obsessed men. He abolished mediumship and mediums in that age. The oracles ceased because the obsessing evil spirits were removed to the hells. Men were given freedom. The Lord, His apostles, and their successors established a religion, the Christian religion, freed from the taint of obsession.

A sure test of spiritism is, that it de-spiritualizes the Scriptures as the Word of God. It lowers Jehovah God, revealed in the Scriptures, to the nature of a spirit. It sees in His Divine Word only mere spirit communications. It sees the Divine Redeemer and Savior as a mere medium only. It sees the revelation of angels, and the visions opening to view the spiritual world, only as materializations. It sees nothing of the Divine and of the spiritual world which are revealed in the Scriptures. It totally perverts the realities opened up to us in this Divine revelation.

It is surprising that Sir Oliver Lodge would write a preface to a book like this. He mildly deprecates the denunciations

which the author makes against the churches and their ministers; but he evidently endorses the author's general treatment of the subject.

It is refreshing to note in contrast with this book the position of Sir William F. Barrett in his work, "On the Threshold of the Unseen," where he says:

> None will find in automatic writing, or other spiritualistic phenomena, the channel for the "communion of saints," which is independent of material agency and attained only in stillness and serenity of soul. *For the psychical order is not the spiritual order;* it deals, as I have said elsewhere, only "with the *external,* though it be in an unseen world; and its chief value lies in the fulfilment of its work *whereby it reveals to us* the inadequacy of the external, either here or hereafter, to satisfy the life of the soul." (Pp. xiii-xiv of Preface.)

JOHN WHITEHEAD.

HISTORIC VIEWS OF LIFE AFTER DEATH

"Religion and the Future Life" * is a collection of addresses by specialists in the various divisions of the History of Religion. These addresses formed the major part of the material given at a seminar conducted in Yale University, under the direction of Professor E. Hershey Sneath, for the purpose of studying the field of the history of belief in life after death in religion and philosophy.

The resulting volume feeds the perpetual interest in this problem of the ages, and its perusal will stimulate a New-Churchman's interest in, and appreciation of, Swedenborg's tremendous contribution to human knowledge of the future life.

As might be expected in a book of this kind, the interest in the different lectures is varied, as the ideas of the human race on immortality—from those of the Primitive Tribes of Men,

---

* *Religion and the Future Life;* the Development of the Belief in Life after Death. By authorities in the history of religion. EDITED BY E. HERSHEY SNEATH, PH.D., LL.D. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co. 1922. 338 pp., 12mo. $3.00.

on through the Egyptian, Indian, Babylonian, Persian, Hebrew, Greek, Mohammedan, and various Christian Fathers and Evangelists—are set before us by these men of note in university circles.

The lecture on "Egyptian Ideas of the Life Hereafter," by James H. Breasted, Ph.D., Professor of Egyptology and Oriental History in the University of Chicago, has the advantage at the present moment of the freshly awakened interest in the tombs and pyramids of Egypt.

Speaking of the language of the inscriptions on the tombs and pyramids, Mr. Breasted has this to say which is of special interest:

> Among the words used in these inscriptions there is a host of utter strangers, a great company of archaic words which have lived a long and active life in a far away world now completely lost and forgotten. Hoary with age, like exhausted runners they totter into sight for a brief period, barely surviving in these ancient texts, then disappear forever, and hence are never met with again. They vaguely disclose to us a vanished world of thought and speech, the last of unnumbered æons through which prehistoric man has passed till he finally comes within hailing distance of us as he enters the historic age. . . . They abound in allusions to incidents in lost myths, to customs and usages long since ended; they are built up out of a fabric of life thought and experience, largely unfamiliar or entirely unknown to us.

So the Egyptian scholar goes back five thousand years, and from that point contemplates a human past even more extensive. It opens a window that reveals an expanse of human past here on earth, that to finite comprehension seems almost as vast as that eternity to which the book looks forward. All such testimony to the age of mankind is in complete accord with the teachings of Emanuel Swedenborg on this subject.

The Editor closes the book with a contribution from his own pen, pointing out the practical significance of belief in life hereafter. He shows clearly how tremendously a belief in a future life, either of reward or of punishment as the case may be, affects human character and behavior. "The dread of something after death," and the hope of future reward, are influential factors in human conduct.

Near the close of his lecture, he quotes the following:

Glory of warrior, glory of orator, glory of song,
Paid with a voice flying to be lost on an endless sea—
Glory of virtue, to fight, to struggle, to right the wrong—
Nay, but she aim'd not at glory, no lover of glory she:
Give her the glory of going on, and still to be.

The wages of sin is death: if the wages of virtue be dust,
Would she have the heart to endure for the life of the worm and the fly?
She desires no isles of the blest, no quiet seats of the just,
To rest in a golden grove, or to bask in a summer sky:
Give her the wages of going on, and not to die.

The above is given as a conception of virtue of a high order, a conception of immortal life which does honor to human nature, and contributes to the real progress of the human race. The Editor's use of this quotation illustrates one strong feature of the book in hand,—an effort to present the best of human thought on this vital subject through the past ages, in the light of the best scholarship of the present moment.

RUSSELL EATON.

THE LIFE OF CHAUNCEY GILES

By CARRIE GILES CARTER

A vital chapter in the history of the New Church. 500 pp., 8 vo., $4

SKETCHES OF THE NEW CHURCH IN AMERICA

By EDNAH C. SILVER

Price $1 net, postage extra (send 24c, and excess will be returned)

PRAYERS

By JOHN WORCESTER

A discourse on prayer, involving an explanation of the Lord's Prayer, followed by thirty-two short prayers suitable for daily use

Price, art paper cover, 25c postpaid; Ooze leather, 50c postpaid

(Size 3¼ x 5¼ inches; will go in an ordinary envelope)

Order the above publications from the

Massachusetts New-Church Union

134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

STANDARD EDITION, $1.00 per volume, postpaid

LIBRARY EDITION, $1.50 per volume, postpaid

Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.

Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

FOR MISSIONARY PURPOSES

we supply the UNIFORM EDITION books (paper) at 5 cents per copy, postpaid.

THE AMERICAN SWEDENBORG PRINTING AND PUBLISHING SOCIETY

16 East 41st Street New York, N. Y.

TWO REMARKABLE BOOKS
By HENRY JAMES
NOW AGAIN AVAILABLE.

Henry James, the elder, was the father of the famous novelist of the same name, and of the still more famous psychologist, Professor William James, who doubtless would not have attained the eminence they did but for their remarkable progenitor. Though never a member of the New-Church organization (which he unfortunately scoffed at and vilified, ignoring its inevitableness), he was nevertheless a most energetic advocate of Swedenborg's teachings as he understood them. The two books here advertised were first published by the Houghton, Mifflin Co. in 1869 and 1879, but have been unavailable for some time. Recently we were able to buy up the remaining unbound sheets, and now offer them in bound form for the benefit of other readers. The former prices were $2.50 and $3 00 respectively. The new price is $2.00 each, postpaid.

SOCIETY THE REDEEMED FORM OF MAN AND THE EARNEST OF GOD'S OMNIPOTENCE IN HUMAN NATURE.

"This handsome volume contains the latest reflections upon the doctrines of Swedenborg in their practical application to man and to society of, perhaps, the most original thinker among the readers of Swedenborg's works. Original, we mean, in this: that there is nothing of the commonplace in what Mr. James gives to the world . . With this decided originality, too, in thought, we always expect to find quite as decided an originality in style, humorous or out-of-the-way illustrations, whimsical references to men and incidents, vigorous periods, and striking epithets: all these abound . . . . . These peculiarities of thought and style may be found in this book in abundance exceeding anything to be found in 'Substance and Shadow,' and 'The Secret of Swedenborg,' remarkable as those books are in all the particulars we have mentioned. **Yet notwithstanding all that can and must be said in disparagement of Mr. James' work, no one can carefully read them without great gain.**"

(Introductory words of C. H. Drew in his review of this book in vol. 3 of the New Series of the **New Jerusalem Magazine**, pp. 39-44.)

THE SECRET OF SWEDENBORG
Being an Elucidation of His Doctrine of the Divine Natural Humanity.

"The following seem to have been the objects which Mr. James proposed to himself in writing this book,—that Swedenborg as a philosopher is not an idealist, and will be found, to a student of philosophy, immeasurably superior to the prince of idealists, Hegel; that the doctrine of the Divine Humanity, as Mr. James understands it, is not so clearly presented by Swedenborg, but that it needs a simpler, better, and different presentation to make it understood by the world; and that this doctrine is the explanation of certain exceedingly perplexing questions of philosophy, and the way out of many philosophical difficulties; to show something of the operations of Mr. James' mind in its process of apprehension of this doctrine; and, lastly and specially, to vilify and express his contempt for those receivers of the doctrines taught by Swedenborg who have formed church societies."

(From the review of this book by C. H. Drew in vol. 42 of the *New Jerusalem Magazine*, pp. 472-479.)

Prices Reduced to $2.00 Each, Postpaid.

Orders, accompanied by checks made payable to Albert P. Carter, Treasurer, should be sent to the

MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 Bowdoin Street, - - - - Boston 9, Mass.